DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 325 525 TM 015 783

AUTHOR Burrell, Lewis P.; Asche, Wayne A.
TITLE A Study of the Training Needs of Vocational Education Teachers with Mainstreamed Special Education Students.
SPONS AGENCY Ohio State Dept. of Education, Columbus. Div. of Vocational Education.
PUB DATE Oct 90
CONTRACT 440929; ODE90-PD-0002
NOTE 75p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association (12th, Chicago, IL, October 17-20, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Needs; *Inservice Teacher Education; Mail Surveys; Mainstreaming; *Professional Training; Secondary Education; *Special Education; State Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Education; Vocational Education; *Vocational Education Teachers
IDENTIFIERS Ohio; Vocational Education Training Needs Instrument

ABSTRACT

To examine vocational educator's perceptions on the importance of and need for training when working with vocational education students and mainstreamed special education students, a survey was mailed to a total of 1,100 vocational teachers, special needs coordinators, vocational evaluators, and state supervisory staff in Ohio. Responses to a demographic questionnaire and a 46-item training need instrument, the Vocational Education Training Need (VETN) survey instrument, were received from 331 subjects (a response rate of about 30%). The total VETN scale, three major program cluster subscales, and eight factor subscales were found to be reliable and valid. There were significant differences in the perceptions of both the importance of training and the need for training required for typical students and mainstreamed special education students, with the latter perceived to require more training for teachers. Implications for teacher education and inservice training are discussed. Appendix A contains the VETN participation letter, the VETN demographic questionnaire, and the VETN instrument. Appendix B presents 25 tables of survey results for subscales and factors. Appendix C defines terms used in the study. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED325525

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

LEWIS P. BURRELL

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Study Of The Training Needs Of Vocational Teachers With Mainstreamed Special Education Students

Ohio North East Regional Vocational Education Personnel Center
Contract No. ODE90-PD-0002
Center Grant Number 440929

by

Lewis P. Burrell, Ed.D.
Wayne A. Asche, Ph.D.

Kent State University
300 White Hall
Kent, Ohio 44242
(216) 672-2656

Presentation at the

1990 Mid-Western Educational Research Association Conference

October 17-20, 1990
Chicago, Illinois

TM015783

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors wish to express appreciation to the following:

the Ohio Department of Education/Division of Vocational Education for its support through the Northeast Ohio Personnel Development Regional Center;

the participating faculty and staff from the Ohio-based schools who assisted with the data collection; and

Myungsook Lee, doctoral student at Kent State University, for her assistance with the computer data entry and statistical analyses.

ABSTRACT

In order to examine the vocational educators' perceptions on the importance-of-training and the need-for-training when working with typical vocational education students and mainstreamed special education students, Ohio vocational state staff, vocational education teachers, evaluators, and vocational special education coordinators completed pertinent information on a 14-category demographic questionnaire and a 46-item Vocational Education Training Need (VETN) survey instrument.

The state-wide study describes the results of the VETN scale, a measure designed to assess the degree to which the vocational educators perceived the importance-of-training and the need-for-training of both typical and mainstreamed vocational students. The instrument assesses the vocational educators' perceived importance-of-training and need-for-training in terms of three major areas: pre-program, program, and post-program.

The three major program areas of the study included eight factors as follows: assessment and evaluation, counseling and referral, program placement, remediation, tutoring, specialized services, job placement, and follow-up.

The study reported the test reliability and validity for the VETN scale. A total VETN scale, the three major program cluster sub-scales, and eight factor sub-scales were found to be reliable and valid. The results indicated significant differences in the perception of both the importance-of-training and the need-for-training between the typical vocational education (VOED) and the mainstreamed special education (SPED) students in three major program areas and across the eight factors listed above. The results were perceived as being more weighted toward the mainstreamed students than the typical vocational students on dependent measures. The results of the relationships between the Vocational Education Need Training Scale and demographic background variables were also compared. Several demographic background variable groups indicated significant differences.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENT ii

ABSTRACT iii

LIST OF TABLES v

FORMULATION AND DEFINITION OF THE PROBLEM. 1
- Preface 1
- Introduction 1
- Mainstreamed Model. 5
- Hypotheses. 6
- Purpose and Objectives. 8

DESIGN OF THE STUDY. 9
- The Sample. 9
- Procedure 9
- Instrument. 9

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA. 12
- Hypothesis 1. 12
- Hypothesis 2. 13
- Hypothesis 3. 13
  - The Eight Program Factors. 14
  - The Three Major Program Areas. 16
  - The Total Population Composite 16
- Hypothesis 4. 17
  - The Eight Program Factors. 17
  - The Three Major Program Areas. 17
  - The Total Population Composite 18
- The Mainstream Model. 19
  - The Eight Program Factors. 19
  - The Three Major Program Areas. 21
  - The Total Population Composite 22
- Additional Data 23

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS. 23
- Conclusions and Findings. 23
- Implications. 24

BIBLIOGRAPHY 26

APPENDIX 28
- A. Vocational Education Training Need (VETN) Questionnaire
  - The VETN Participation Letter. 29
  - The VETN Demographic Questionnaire 30
  - The VETN Instrument. 31
- B. Tables. 35
  - Mean and Standard Deviations 36
  - Correlation Matrix 40
  - Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) 42
  - Mean Score Comparisons and Rank Order Listings . . 53
- C. Definition of Terms 65

List of Tables
(Refer to Appendix B)

Table — Page

1. Mean and standard deviations of the 46 items on the VETN instrument on Importance-Of-Training for both VOED and SPED students. (N=331). 36
2. Mean and standard deviations of the 46 items on the VETN instrument on Need-For-Training for both VOED and SPED students. (N=331) 37
3. A comparison of educator responses "between" the typical VOED and the mainstreamed SPED students on the total scores, eight factors, and three program clusters 38
4. Mean and standard deviations of 8 factors and 3 program clusters of the variables which determined the Importance-Of-Training and Need-For-Training for both groups of responses: VOED and SPED.. 39
5. Correlation matrix of 8 factors and 3 program clusters. . 40
6. Summary of ANOVA on the factor of assessment and evaluation by demographic variables.. 42
7. Summary of ANOVA on the factor of counseling and referral by demographic background variables. 43
8. Summary of ANOVA on the factor program placement by demographic background variables. 44
9. Summary of the ANOVA on the factor remedial by teachers' demographic background variables. 45
10. Summary of the ANOVA on the factor tutoring support by teachers' demographic background variables . . 46
11. Summary of the ANOVA on the factor special service by teachers' demographic background variables . . 47
12. Summary of the ANOVA on the factor job placement by teachers' demographic background variables 48
13. Summary of the ANOVA on the pre-program cluster by teachers' demographic background variables. 49
14. Summary of the ANOVA on the program cluster by teachers' demographic background variables 50
15. Summary of the ANOVA on the post-program cluster by teachers' demographic background variables 51
16. Summary of the ANOVA on the total VENT measures by teachers' demographic background variables 52
17. Mean score comparisons of Importance-Of-Training for VOED and SPED students. 53
18. Mean score comparisons of Need-For-Training for VOED and SPED students. 54
19. Rank order of mean scores on Importance-Of-Training for teachers of VOED students.. 55
20. Rank order of mean scores on Importance-Of-Training for teachers of SPED students.. 56
21. Rank order of mean scores on Need-For-Training for teachers of VOED students.. 57
22. Rank order of mean scores on Need-For-Training for teachers of SPED students.. 58

TABLES continued

23. Categorical list of VETN items for three major program areas and eight factors.. 59
24. Categorical list of Importance-Of-Training mean scores by three major program areas and eight factors. 61
25. Categorical list of Need-For-Training mean scores by three major program areas and eight factors. 63

FORMULATION AND DEFINITION OF THE PROBLEM

PREFACE

The purpose of this paper is to present the findings of a study designed to identify the inservice training need in the State of Ohio for those who work with the typical and the mainstreamed vocational education students. The study was conducted by the Northeast Ohio Personnel Development Regional Center of Kent State University in conjunction with the Ohio Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education.

To our knowledge, this is the first such comparison of need in the nation which involves these two populations of students. A review of the literature and other data analyses provide studies of either typical vocational students or mainstreamed vocational students but do not compare the two groups in terms of teacher need-for-training.

This study provides a comparison of typical vocational education and mainstreamed special education students in terms of both the perceived importance-of-training and the perceived need-for-training for vocational teachers who teach students with special needs.

INTRODUCTION

The importance of maintaining high quality vocational programs has always been a major concern for those involved with vocational education program planning. One of the important factors that has admittedly affected the quality of vocational

programs in the schools has been the support service component which was recently initiated to accommodate both the typical and the mainstreamed vocational education students.

In 1983, the Ohio Advisory Council for Vocational Education provided the Handbook on Mainstreaming Handicapped Students in Vocational Education. Since that initial awareness and support publication, vocational educators in Ohio have become more involved in the training of the handicapped. As vocational educators have become more involved, there has evolved an awareness of the need for more specific training in various aspects of the vocational program in order to provide a more effective outcome for the learner in the least restricted environment.

The State of Ohio has many students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) who have been mainstreamed into the vocational education programs. In Ohio schools during 1988, there were 21,372 handicapped and 42,066 disadvantaged students who were mainstreamed into vocational education classes. The total secondary school vocational enrollment for 1988 in Ohio was 244,133 students. In accordance with the state education mission, the schools have been attempting to provide each student, as an individual, the opportunity to develop to the fullest degree within his or her vocational potential.

In Ohio, students with special needs are more prevalent in some vocational programs than in others. For example, mainstreamed students are often placed in programs such as food

service, community and home service, agriculture, and automotive body and fender repair. Some programs such as electronics, cosmetology, or computer programming have few special needs student enrollees. Teachers who have had the higher concentrations of special needs students have needed and received a more focused teacher education training along with more special education support services for their vocational programs. Under current regulation, the higher technical program areas have also been assigned special needs students. At present these technical programs are in need of much of the same support to meet the vocational needs of those students who learn differently.

McDaid (1987) indicated that evaluation should be expanded to determine student learning levels which in turn would provide measures of accountability. Cobb (1987), in a similar research study, made implications about necessary adjustments which were needed in the area of special services to more adequately accommodate the special needs students. Provisions within the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act seek to assure the equal access of all students to vocational education programs and to provide the necessary special services needed to enhance the participation of students with special needs.

Identifying the in-service training needs of vocational teachers is one way of assuring that equal support services will be rendered in the educational process for both the typical vocational and the mainstreamed special education students.

Thus, students will ultimately be educated in a least restrictive environment in which both their educational and related life-skill needs can satisfactorily be met. Finally, the responsibility of preparing the special needs students with competencies for job placement will have been shared. The basic and technical skills necessary for success in both the related classroom and the laboratory should receive the support and reinforcement from the expertise of special education teachers, counselors, basic skills teachers, support services personnel, and external support agencies if the mainstreaming process is to be successful.

This research effort was conducted as an integral part of the Northeast Regional Vocational Education Personnel Development Center. The focus of the research was to determine whether or not a training need existed in order to justify the provision of special needs teacher inservice for the current vocational education programs. Significant variance differences identified through the study have been reported in the Results Section. The non-significant variances were not reported.

The Mainstreamed Model (Burrell, 1989) was used to determine the school inservice need factors. The Model has been included as Figure 1.

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY

MAINSTREAMED MODEL FOR

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SPECIAL NEEDS SERVICES

Typical Students

Mainstreamed Students

PRE-PROGRAM SERVICES

ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

COUNSELING AND REFERRAL

PROGRAM PLACEMENT

PROGRAM SERVICES

REMEDIATION

TUTORING

SPECIALIZED SERVICE

POST-PROGRAM SERVICES

JOB PLACEMENT

FOLLOW-UP

*Total Enrollment

180,695 Typical Students

*Total Enrollment

21,372 Handicapped Students

42,066 Disadvantaged Students

*TOTAL VOCATIONAL ENROLLMENT IN OHIO SCHOOLS
244,133 Students

*1988 Enrollment Figures

Figure 1

HYPOTHESES

This research project includes two primary hypotheses as follows:

1. There will be significant differences in vocational educators' perceived Importance-Of-Training between typical vocational education (VOED) students and mainstreamed special education (SPED) students on eight factors, three program clusters, forty-six items, and a total Vocational Education Training Need (VETN) score.

2. There will be significant differences in vocational educators' perceived Need-For-Training between the typical VOED students and mainstreamed SPED students on eight factors, three program clusters, forty-six items, and a total VETN score.

The research further includes analyses on the following fourteen demographic areas:

a. Job title;
b. Service area (or taxonomy area);
c. School type;
d. Grade level of training;
e. Level of the teacher's education;
f. Total years in education;
g. Total years in vocational education;
h. Certificate type;
i. Age;
j. Sex;
k. Number of Vocational Special Education Coordinators in the system;
l. Whether the teachers were teaching students with disabilities;
m. Whether the personnel were trained in special needs education; and
n. Whether personnel were trained in special education.

The two secondary hypotheses dealing with the demographic areas are as follows:

1. There will be significant differences in vocational educators' perceived Importance-of-Training between the typical VOED students and mainstreamed SPED students on the following:

a. Job title;
b. Service area (or taxonomy area);
c. School type;
d. Grade level of training;
e. Level of the teacher's education;
f. Total years in education;
g. Total years in vocational education;
h. Certificate type;
i. Age;
j. Sex;
k. Number of Vocational Special Education Coordinators in the system;
l. Whether the teachers were teaching students with disabilities;
m. Whether the personnel were trained in special needs education; and
n. Whether personnel were trained in special education.

2. There will be significant differences in vocational educators' perceived Need-for-Training between the typical VOED students and mainstreamed SPED students on the following:

a. Job title;
b. Service area (or taxonomy area);
c. School type;
d. Grade level of training;
e. Level of the teacher's education;
f. Total years in education;
g. Total years in vocational education;
h. Certificate type;
i. Age;
j. Sex;
k. Number of Vocational Special Education Coordinators in the system;
l. Whether the teachers were teaching students with disabilities;
m. Whether the personnel were trained in special needs education; and
n. Whether personnel were trained in special education.

PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not an important in-service training need existed in the vocational support service areas for those educators who work with both the typical and the mainstreamed vocational education students.

The three primary objectives of the study were defined as follows:

1. To determine whether any differences exist between educators as to the perceived importance of inservice training for those vocational teachers who teach both the typical vocational education students and the mainstreamed special education students.
2. To determine whether any differences exist between educators as to the perceived need for inservice training for those vocational teachers who teach both the typical vocational students and the mainstreamed special education students.
3. To determine whether any differences exist between educators as to the perceived importance and the perceived need for inservice training by vocational teachers, who teach both the typical vocational students and the mainstreamed special education students, with respect to selected demographic variables: program responsibility, educational experience and training, school type, "Center" region within the State of Ohio, grade level of teaching, certificate type, age, sex, race, number of vocational education students, and number of special education coordinators in the building.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

THE SAMPLE

A Vocational Education Training Need (VETN) instrument was randomly mailed to 1100 subjects state-wide. A total of 331 subjects participated in this study (N=331). Of the total, 174 were male and 153 were female. The ages ranged from 21 to 63 (M=42.5). By race, 288 were caucasian and 5 were black. (Note: Some data were missing.)

The sample consisted of four subject types by job title as follows: vocational teachers, special needs coordinators, vocational evaluators, and state supervisory staff. The sample represented the following vocational education service areas: agricultural, business, marketing education, occupational work adjustment, trade and industrial, occupational work experience, home economics. Some personnel had additional assignments in specialized areas such as: special needs, special education, vocational special education, and adult education.

PROCEDURE

A demographic questionnaire and a Vocational Education Training Need (VETN) instrument (1,100) were mailed state-wide to vocational and special educators who work with mainstreamed vocational education students (see Appendix A). The response rate for this sample was approximately 30 percent, a fairly good return for a survey of this type. The sample appears to represent the target population, to which the results of these analyses can be generalized.

INSTRUMENT

An instrument, Vocational Education Training Need (VETN)

(Burrell, 1989) was designed to measure the vocational educator's perceived Importance-Of-Training and Need-For-Training between the typical vocational education (VOED) and the mainstreamed special education (SPED) students in vocational school settings. The instrument consists of forty-six (46) Likert type items on a 5-point scale (1=no; 2=little; 3=some; 4=considerable; 5=great) for both Importance-of-Training and Need-For-Training. The survey instrument addressed two major areas of concern of vocational educators: a) the way vocational teachers view the Importance-of-Training and, b) the way vocational teachers view their Need-For-Training when teaching a class mix of mainstreamed and regular vocational students. These concerns were consolidated by two student groupings: a) typical vocational education (VOED) students and, b) mainstreamed special education (SPED) students. The mean and standard deviation measures for each item of the survey instrument are included in Tables 1 and 2.

The reliability coefficients (Cronbach Alpha) for Importance-Of-Training measures for VOED students and SPED students, and Need-For-Training for VOED and SPED students were .97, .97, .98, and .98 respectively. This measure was found to be reliable and valid.

The VETN measure included eight (8) factors: a) Assessment and Evaluation, b) Counseling and Referral, c) Program Placement, d) Remediation, e) Tutoring, f) Specialized Service, g) Job Placement, and f) Follow-Up.

Each factor had four dimensions (Importance-Of-Training for VOED and SPED students, and Need-For-Training for VOED and SPED students).

The first factor, Assessment and Evaluation (5 items), reliability coefficients were: .82, .83, .88, and .86 respectively. The second factor, Counseling and Referral (3 items), reliability coefficients were: .67, .70, .78, and .78 respectively. The third factor, Program Placement (6 items), reliability coefficients were: .82, .83, .87, and .88 respectively. The forth factor, Remediation (12 items), reliability coefficients were: .68, .71, .72, and .74 respectively. The fifth factor, Tutoring (16 items), support reliability coefficients were: .82, .81, .88, and .85 respectively. The sixth factor, Specialized Service (16 items), reliability coefficients were: .92, .94, .95, and .95 respectively. The seventh factor, Job Placement (13 items), reliability coefficients were: .69, .70, .80, and .78 respectively. Finally, the eighth factor, Follow-Up (5 items), reliability coefficients were: .79, .80, .86, and .87 respectively.

The above eight factors were grouped into three major program clusters: a) pre-program, b) program, and c) post-program. These three major programs also had four dimensions (Importance-Of-Training for VOED and SPED students, and Need-For-Training for VOED and SPED students).

The pre-program cluster (Assessment, Counseling and Referral, Program Placement) reliability coefficients were .89, .91, .94 and .94 respectively. Program cluster (Remedial, Tutoring, Specialized Service) reliability coefficients were: .91, .92, .94, and .93 respectively. Post-program cluster (Job Placement, Follow-up) reliability coefficients were: .83, .85, .89, and .89 respectively.

The dependent measures of the present study were the above eight factors plus the three major clusters, and the total scores of the VETN measures.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSSX) was used for the statistical analysis.

In order to test the hypotheses 1 and 2, t-tests were computed. A summary of the t-test results if shown in the Table 3. To examine the relationship between the fourteen (14) demographic background variables and the dependent measures, one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used (see Tables 6-16). In appropriate cases the Newman-Keuls and Scheffe *a posteriori* and the Pearson product-moment correlation tests were used.

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

HYPOTHESIS 1

The results showed that eight (8) Special Needs services for Importance-Of-Training were significantly different between the VOED and SPED groups (see Table 3), t-values were ranged from -9.20 to -4.28, df=330, $p<.001$. All tests were 2-tailed. Educators perceived Importance differently. More emphasis was placed on the mainstreamed SPED students than the typical VOED students on the eight factors.

For the three (3) program clusters, the results also showed significant group mean differences between the two groups (see Table 3), t-values were -6.76, -7.18, and -6.02, df=330, $p<.001$. From the above results, it appears that, educators perceive differently the Importance of Training of the two groups.

A total score of Importance-Of-Training of the two groups were

also compared. The results showed that these two main constructs were perceived significantly different ($t(330)=-7.76$, $p<.001$).

HYPOTHESIS 2

The results show that the eight (8) special needs services for Need-For-Training were significantly different between the VOED and SPED groups (see Table 3). The t-values ranged from -11.59 to -5.99, df=330, $p<.001$. All tests were 2-tailed. The educators perceived differently the Need-For-Training between the two groups. For the three (3) program clusters, the results also showed significant group mean differences between the two groups (see Table 3). The t-values were -8.47, -11.08, and -7.86, df=330, $p<001$. Educators perceived differently both Importance-Of-Training and Need-For-Training in terms of the three program clusters (see Table 4). Pearson product-moment correlations of the eight factors and three program clusters provided an additional measure of the relationships of the items of the VETN. The correlations were relatively high with the SPED scores having higher correlations overall than the VOED scores (see Table 5).

A total score for Need-For-Training for the two groups was also compared. The results showed that these two main constructs were perceived significantly different ($t(330)=10.58$, $p<.001$) (see Table 3). Statistically, a higher emphasis was placed on the mainstreamed SPED students than on typical VOED students in eight factors.

HYPOTHESIS 3

The result of one-way ANOVA showed that the factors; Assessment, Counseling and Referral, Program Placement, Remedial, and Job

Placement were not significantly different across the job title group. The fifth factor, Tutoring on Importance and Need-For-Training for typical VOED and SPED mainstreamed students were significantly different $F(3, 327)=4.65$, $p<.01$; $F(3, 327)=3.90$, $p<.01$; $F(3, 327)=2.88$, $p<.05$; and $F(3, 327)=3.62$, $p<.05$). (See Tables 6-16.)

The Eight Program Factors: Tutoring score on Importance for VOED students was significantly different across the four job titles (Evaluator, Teacher, Coordinator, and Supervisor) on the Newman-Keuls and Scheffe *a posteriori* tests at p=.05 level. Tutoring scores in Importance for SPED mainstreamed students were significantly different across the four job titles. The Newman-Keuls test was also applied to this data. Supervisors mean ratings were higher than Coordinators, Teachers, and Evaluators (Mean=4.52, 4.12, 4.09, 4.08 respectively). (See Table 10.)

Tutoring scores in Need-for-Training for VOED students were significantly different across the four job title groupings (Evaluator, Teacher, Coordinator, and Supervisor) on the Newman-Keuls and Scheffe Test at the p=.05 level (Mean=3.66, 3.20, 3.15, 3.11 respectively). Tutoring scores in Need-for-Training for SPED mainstreamed students was significantly different across the four job title groupings also on the Newman-Keuls and Scheffe Tests. Supervisors mean ratings were higher than the Teachers, Evaluators, and Coordinators respectively (Mean=3.96, 3.56, 3.52, 3.48 respectively). (See Table 10.)

The factor Special Service score in Importance-Of-Training for

VOED students was significantly different across the Job Title groups, $F(3, 327)=3.69$, $p<.05$. The factor Special Service score in Importance-Of-Training for SPED students was significantly different across the Job Title group, $F(3, 327)=2.90$, $p<.05$. But the Special Service factor for Need-for-Training was not significant. The post hoc test of Newman-Keuls procedure was significant at the .05 level. The mean scores were 4.26, 3.90, 3.90, 3.74 for Supervisor, Teacher, Coordinator, and Evaluator. The Scheffe Procedure showed was significance at the .05 level for Supervisor ($M=4.26$) and Evaluator ($M=3.74$). For the SPED mainstreamed students the factor score showed a significant difference only for Supervisor and Teacher ($M=4.12$) with the Newman-Keuls test ($M=4.47$). (See Table 11.)

The factor Follow-up for the typical VOED students on Importance was significantly different across the Job Title group $F(3, 327)=2.74$, $p<.05$. Newman-Keuls procedure at .05 level showed different group variance ($M=4.20$, 3.87, 3.81, 3.72) respectively with Supervisor, Coordinator, Teacher, and Evaluator. The Scheffe test at the .05 level showed group differences for Supervisor ($M=4.20$) and Evaluator ($M=3.72$). The factor Follow-up for the SPED mainstreamed students on Importance was not significantly different across the group.

The factor Follow-up for the Need-For-Training for the VOED students by Job Title was significantly different. $F(3, 327)=3.16$, $p<.05$. Newman-Keuls procedure at .05 level of significance showed that significant group variance ($M=3.54$, 3.03, 2.98, 2.96) with respect to Supervisors, Coordinators, Teachers, and Evaluators. The

Scheffe test at the .05 level of significance showed significant group differences for Supervisor (M=3.54), Teacher (M=2.98), Evaluator (M=2.96), but not for the Coordinator group.

The factor Follow-up for the SPED mainstreamed students on Need-For-Training was significant at the level .05 for the Job Title group, $F(3, 327)=2.66$, $p<.05$. The Newman-Keuls Procedure at the .05 level showed significant group variance along with Supervisor (M=3.74), Evaluator (M=3.33), Coordinator (M=3.24), and Teacher (M=3.28).

The Three Program Areas: For the three major program clusters (pre-program, program, and post-program), only the program cluster for Importance-Of-Training for typical VOED students showed significant group variances ($F(3,327)=3.30$, $p<.05$). The Newman-Keuls procedure at the .05 level showed significant differences for Supervisor (M=3.93), and Evaluator (M=3.78). For the Scheffe Test at the .05 level, the only significant group variance was between Supervisor (M=4.28) and Evaluator (M=3.78). (See Tables 13-15.)

The Total Population Composite: For the total score of Importance-Of-Training for typical VOED students, the measures were significantly different across the Job Title group, $F(3, 327)=2.62$, $p<.05$. The Newman-Keuls Test at the .05 level also showed significant group variance differences. The mean of Supervisor groups was 4.17, and for Teacher 3.89, and for Evaluator 3.75. The Scheffe Test at tne .05 level showed significant group variance differences only between Supervisor (M=4.17) and Evaluator (M=3.75). (See Table 16.)

For the total score of Importance-Of-Training for mainstreamed

SPED students, the measures for Need-For-Training for both VOED and SPED students were not significantly different across the Job Title group.

HYPOTHESIS 4

In order to examine the differences on the Importance and the Need-For-Training for eight (8) factors, three major program clusters and a total score across the nine Service Areas (Agriculture, Business, Marketing, OWA, T & I, OWE, Home Economics, Special Needs Education, VOSE Coordinator), the ANOVA was executed.

The Eight Program Factors: For the eight (8) factor dependent measures, the results showed that the factor Assessment on Importance-Of-Training for mainstreamed SPED students $F(8, 308)=2.54$, $p<.01$; Counseling and Referral on Importance for mainstreamed SPED students $F(8, 308)=2.51$, $p<.05$; Program Placement on Importance-Of-Training for mainstreamed SPED students $F(8, 308)=2.91$, $p<.01$; Remedial on Importance-Of-Training and Need-For Training for mainstreamed SPED students $F(8, 308)=3.31$, $p=.01$; and $F(8, 308)=2.33$, $p<.05$; Tutoring on Importance-Of-Training and Need-For-Training for mainstreamed SPED students $F(8, 308)=2.23$, $p<.05$ and $F(8, 308)=2.22$, $p<.05$; Special Services on Importance-Of-Training and Need-For-Training for mainstreamed SPED students $F(8, 308)=3.87$, $p<.001$ and $F(8, 308)=2.63$, $p<.01$; Job Placement on Importance-Of-Training for mainstreamed SPED students $F(8, 308)=2.14$, $p<.05$; Follow-up also showed significant group variance differences across the nine service areas (see Tables 6-12).

The Three Major Program Areas: For the three program clusters (pre-

program, program, and post-program) by nine (9) service areas, pre-program on Importance-Of-Training for mainstreamed SPED students showed significance $F(8, 308)=2.78$, $p<.01$. Program on Importance-Of-Training and Need-For-Training for mainstreamed SPED students ($F(8, 308)=3.25$, $p<.01$ and $F(8, 308)=2.57$, $p<.01$ respectively) showed significant group variance differences at each alpha level (see Tables 13-15).

The Total Population Composite: A total score on Importance-Of-Training and Need-For-Training for mainstreamed SPED students on the VETN measures by the above nine (9) service areas was significant ($F8, 308)=2.90$, $p<.01$ and $F(8, 308)=2.07$, $p<.05$. The total score on Importance-Of-Training and Need-For-Training for typical VOED students on the VETN measures by the above nine (9) service areas above was not significant (see Table 16).

In regards to the two secondary hypotheses, the significant teachers' background variables included: School Type, Grade Levels of Teaching, Teachers' Levels of Education, Total Years in Education, Total Years in Vocational Education, Certificate Type, and Age, Sex, Number of Students with Disabilities Taught Daily, whether Trained in Special Needs Education, and whether Trained in Special Education, Number of Vocational Special Education Coordinators were considered to be important variables for the vocational educators and vocational teachers for mainstreamed SPED students as well as typical VOED students. Statistical results showed that all eight factors for Importance-Of-Training and Need-For-Training in two groups were significantly different across the above twelve (12) teacher's

personal background variables (see Tables 6-12).

THE MAINSTREAMED MODEL

The Eight Program Factors:

A. For the Assessment and Evaluation factor, the Importance-Of-Training on mainstreamed SPED students showed significant group variance on Number of Special Education Coordinators and whether Trained in Special Education. For the Assessment and Referral factor on Need-for-Training on mainstreamed SPED students showed significantly different group variances along with Teacher's Level of Education and Number of Special Education Coordinators.

B. For the Counseling and Referral factor, the Teacher's Level of Education appeared to be a main source of group differences for Importance-Of-Training and Need-for-Training for SPED and VOED student groups. Counseling and Referral factor on Importance-Of-Training for mainstreamed SPED students by School Type, and the Counseling and Referral factor on Need-for-Training on SPED students by Type of Teacher Certificate showed significant group variance differences.

C. Program Placement factor scores on Importance-Of-Training for SPED students showed significant differences along with School Type, Total Years of Education, Years in Vocational Education, and Number of VOSE Coordinators. Program Placement factor scores on Need-For Training for typical VOED students showed significant differences with Teacher Sex and Teacher Level of Education.

D. Remediation factor scores on Importance-Of-Training for mainstreamed SPED students showed between group differences along

with School Type, Sex, Grade Level of Teaching, Years in Education, Number of VOED Coordinators. Remediation factor scores on Need-For-Training for mainstreamed SPED students showed significant between group differences along with School Type and Number of VOSE Coordinators. Remediation factor scores on Need-For-Training for typical VOED students showed significant between group differences with Teacher Sex.

E. Tutoring factor scores on Importance-Of-Training and Need-For-Training for both VOED and SPED students appeared to have significant between group differences with School Type. Tutoring factor scores of Importance for mainstreamed SPED students showed significant group variance differences along with Teacher Sex and whether the Teacher teaches disability students daily.

F. Specialized Service factor scores on Importance-Of-Training for mainstreamed SPED students showed between group differences along with school-type, Teachers' Sex, Total Years in Education, Number of VOSE Coordinators, whether Trained in Special Needs Education, and Trained in Special Education. Specialized Service factor scores of Need-For-Training showed significant between group differences along with School Type and Teacher Sex.

G. Job Placement factor scores of Importance-Of-Training for mainstreamed SPED students showed significant between group differences along with School Type, Number of VOSE Coordinators, whether Trained in Special Needs Education, and whether Trained in Special Education. Job Placement factor scores of Need-for-Training for mainstreamed SPED students showed between group differences with

Teacher's Level of Education.

H. The final factor Follow-Up factor scores of Importance-Of-Training for mainstreamed SPED students showed significant group differences along with School Type, Total Years in Education, Number of VOSE Coordinators, and Whether Trained in Special Education. Follow-Up scores for Need-for-Training for mainstreamed SPED students showed significant group differences along with School Type, Teacher's Level of Education, and Number of VOSE Coordinators. Follow-up scores of Need-for Training for typical VOED students showed group differences with Teacher's Level of Education.

The Three Major Program Areas:

Three major program clusters (pre-program, program, post-program) with regard to the secondary hypotheses were also analyzed (see Tables 13-15). The Pre-Program cluster on Importance-Of-Training, for the mainstreamed SPED students showed significant group variances with School Type ($F(3, 308)=4.36$, $p<.01$); Sex ($F(1, 325)=5.05$, $p<.05$), Level of Teacher Education ($F(2,285)=3.04$, $p<.05$), Number of VOSE Coordinators ($F(5, 268)=2.35$, $p<.05$). The Pre-Program cluster scores on Need-for Training for mainstreamed SPED students showed significant group variances with the Teacher's Educational Level and Number of VOSE Coordinators ($F(2, 285)=4.52$, p.05) and ($F(5, 268)=2.38$, $p<.05$).

The Program cluster on Importance-Of-Training for the mainstreamed SPED students showed significant group variances with School Type ($F(3, 308)=5.38$, $p<.01$, Sex ($F(1,325)=6.75$, $p<.01$), Total Years in Education ($F(5, 292)=2.84$, $p<.05$), Number of VOSE

Coordinators ($F(9, 268)=2.87$, $p<.05$), and whether Trained in Special Education ($F(1, 299)=3.93$, $p<.05$). The Program cluster on Need-for-Training for mainstreamed SPED students showed significant group effect with School Type and Number of VOSE Coordinators ($F(3, 308)=3.57$, $p<.05$) and ($F(5, 268)=2.25$, $p<.05$).

The Post-Program cluster on Importance-Of-Training for the mainstreamed SPED students showed significant group variances with School Type ($F(3, 308)=4.72$, $p<.01$), Sex ($F(1, 325)=4.71$, $p<.05$), Total Years of Education ($F(5, 292)=2.30$, $p<.05$), Number of VOSE Coordinators ($F(5, 268=3.55$, $p<.01$), Trained in Special Needs Education ($F(1, 298)=6.16$, $p<.015$) and Trained in Special Education ($F(1, 299)=4.63$, $p<.05$).

The Post-Program cluster on Need-For Training for mainstreamed SPED students showed significant between group effect with Teacher's Level of Education ($F(2, 285)=3.76$, $p<.05$), Number of VOSE Coordinators ($F(5, 268)=2.71$, $p<.05$) respectively. The post-program scores of Need-for-Training for typical VOED students showed significant group differences with teacher's levels of education ($F(2, 285)=3.33$, $p<.05$).

<u>The Total Population Composite:</u>

The VETN Total scores on Importance-Of-Training for the mainstreamed SPED students showed significant group variances with School Type ($F(3, 304)=5.70$, $p<.01$), Sex ($F(1, 321)=7.86$, $p<.01$), Number of VOSE Coordinators ($F(5, 264)=3.39$, $p<.01$), Training in Special Needs Education ($F(1, 294)=4.15$, $p<.05$), and Training in Special Education ($F(1, 295)=4.97$, $p<.05$). (See Table 16.)

The VETN Total scores on Need-for-Training for the mainstreamed SPED students showed significant group variances with Teacher Level of Education ($F(2,126)=3.63$, $p<.05$) and Number of VOSE Coordinators ($F(5, 264)=2.86$, $p<.05$).

ADDITIONAL DATA

Mean score comparisons have been presented from the VETN instrument in order for program planners to determine the degree to which the population responded on each item. The comparisons of this section include: Importance-Of-Training mean response comparisons for VOED and SPED; Need-For-Training mean response comparisons for VOED and SPED; VETN mean scores in rank order by Importance-Of-Training and Need-For-Training; and an identification of the VETN items by each of the eight factors and three program areas (see Tables 17-25). The definition of terms have been included as Appendix C.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

CONCLUSIONS AND FINDINGS

The dependent measures of eight special needs services factors, three major program clusters, and a total VETN score were treated across fourteen background variables. Each factor in the analysis had four dimensions: Importance-Of-Training and Need-For-Training comparisons for VOED and SPED students. The reliability coefficients (Cronbach Alpha) for Importance-Of-Training and Need-For-Training measures for VOED and SPED students with the VETN proved reliable and valid. The t-tests proved that educators tend to view the eight special needs services factors differently between the VOED and SPED groups. A higher emphasis was placed on the mainstreamed SPED

students than the typical VOED students on the eight factors. The t-tests also proved that educators perceive a difference in Importance-Of-Training and Need-For-Training in the pre-program, program, and post-program groups. In the analyses of the total scores cluster, the Need-For-Training for the two groups were perceived significantly different.

IMPLICATIONS

1. In terms of the eight special needs service factors, a plan needs to be devised to bring about more uniformity among school personnel in addressing the Importance-Of-Training and Need-For-Training regarding the special needs services for the typical vocational education student and the special needs mainstreamed student in vocational programs.

2. According to the results of the program cluster analyses, the emphasis for the mainstream students in vocational education was stressed differently by the vocational state staff and vocational educators including teachers, evaluators, and coordinators. Therefore, vocational education program planners should review available support resources and teaching strategies, facilities and intervention models with the vocational specialists to more appropriately provide services to mainstreamed students in vocational education programs.

3. In view of the findings from this study, which revealed significant differences in the perceived Importance-Of-Training and Need-For-Training within the three program areas (pre-program, program and post-program), future special needs inservice planning

should include closer planning with the specialists in order to better serve the mainstreamed students.

4. Further comparative analyses need to be conducted on the independent variable such as the Options (Applied Academics) program in order to understand how other independent variables might relate to special needs services.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alabama State Dept. of Education. (1987). All You Ever Wanted to Know About Special Needs But Didn't Know Who to Ask. Special Needs Handbook. Montgomery: Alabama State Dept. of Education, Division of Vocational Education Services.

Albright, L. (1986). Vocational Education for the Disadvantaged and Handicapped. A Guide to Program Administration. Alexandria, VA: American Vocational Association.

Asselin, S. (1987). Making the transition: A teacher's guide for helping students with special needs. Alexandria, VA: American Vocational Association.

Brolin, D.E. (1982). Vocational Preparation of Persons with Handicaps. 2nd ed. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co.

Cobb, R.B. (1987). Educating the handicapped to enter the world of work. PRISE Reporter, Sept., 1989.

Fuchs, D. & Fuchs, L. (1987). Mainstream Assistance Teams to Accommodate Difficult-to-Teach Students in General Education. Washington, D.C.: Office of Special Education.

Hamilton, J. (1987). Handbook on Mainstreaming Handicapped Students in Vocational Education. Westerville, OH: Ohio State Council on Vocational Education.

Institute for the Study of Family, Work, and Community. Improving the options of handicapped students in mainstream vocational education. Final report. Berkeley.

Lawless, K. (1986). Neediest of the needy: Special education for migrants. Harvesting the harvesters. Book 8. Potsdam: State University of New York.

Meers, G. (1987). Handbook of Vocational Special Needs Education. Rockville, MD: Aspen Publisher, Inc.

Missouri State Dept. of Elementary and Secondary Education (1987). Building Trades. Carpentry, Electrical Wiring, Plumbing. Columbia: Missouri University, Instructional Materials Lab.

Morley, R. et al (1987). Strategies for teaching handicapped students in industrial technology. Des Moines: Iowa State Dept. of Education.

McDaid, J. (1987). Special education annual program evaluation. Evaluation Department Report No. 473. San Diego Schools, CA: Planning, Research and Evaluation Division.

Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. (1987). Research on the effectiveness of mainstreaming. Abstract XIV: Research & resources on special education.

Ohio Department of Education, (1977). Rules for the Education of Handicapped Children, Columbus, OH.

Pennsylvania State University, Dept. of Agricultural and Extension Education. (1986). Enhancement of pedagogical abilities of vocational teachers to serve handicapped students in regular CBVE programs - Year 2. Final report. Teacher Education Research Series, 27:1.

Salend, S. (1983). Mainstreaming: Sharpening up follow-up. Academic Therapy, 18:3, 299-304.

Sarkees, M.D. and Scott, J.L. (1985). Vocational Special Needs, 2nd Ed. American Technical Publishers.

Wilkes, H., Bireley, M., & Schultz, J. (1979). Criteria for mainstreaming the learning disabled child into the regular classroom. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 12:4, 46-51.

Wircenski, J. (1986). Providing support services to disadvantaged youth and adults in vocational education. Paper presented at the American Vocational Association Convention.

APPENDIX A

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION TRAINING NEED (VETN) LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE

STATE OF OHIO
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
COLUMBUS

FRANKLIN B. WALTER
SUPERINTENDENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

DARRELL L. PARKS, DIRECTOR
VOCATIONAL AND CAREER EDUCATION
907 OHIO DEPARTMENTS BUILDING
65 South Front Street
Columbus, Ohio 43266-0308

April 28, 1989

Dear Administrator and Participant:

The Northeast Ohio Personnel Development Center of Kent State University in conjunction with the Ohio Department of Education, Vocational Division, has elected to study the inservice training need in Ohio for those who work with the regular and the mainstreamed vocational education students.

To our knowledge, this is the first such comparison of need in the nation which involves this population of students. Your careful response to the questions on the enclosed questionnaire is critical to our study. The results of this survey will be disseminated to you, school administrators, ODE/VOED, and other institutions who work directly with the vocational training of these students.

The survey will provide comparisons of two school groups of students in terms of school inservice needs; namely, the typical vocational education students and the mainstreamed special education students.

In order for us to meet our deadline, please return this questionnaire to us by May 18.

We wish to thank you in adv[illegible]r becoming involved in this very critical area of educat[illegible].

Sincerely,

Joanna Kister, Ph.D.
Assistant Director
Home Economics Education
Room 912, Ohio Departments Building
65 South Front Street
Columbus, Ohio 43266-0308

Wayne E. Asche, Ph.D.
Director, NE Ohio
Personnel Development
Center
ACHVE Department
300 White Hall
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio 44242
(216) 672-2656

cbt

QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I: Information about you as a participant and your school.

1. Please identify your present job title and/or instructional program.
_____

2. Please check the following relevant school information:
   (a) Your service area.
   ___ Agricultural (Ag)
   ___ Business (BE)
   ___ Marketing Education (Mkt)
   ___ Occupational Work Adj. (OWA)
   ___ Trade & Industrial (T&I)
   ___ Occupational Work Exp. (OWE)
   ___ Other (Please identify)
   ___ Vocational Home Economics (HE)
   ___ Special Needs
   ___ Special Education
   ___ VOSE Coordinator
   ___ Adult Educator
   _____
   (b) Your program type.
   ___ 00 (270/minutes lab/rel)
   ___ 01 (225/minutes lab/rel)
   ___ 02 (180/minutes lab/rel)
   ___ Other (Please identify)_____
   ___ 0X (270/minutes lab/rel)
   ___ 0Y (270 minutes lab/rel)
   ___ 0Z (225/minutes lab/rel)
   (c) Your school type.
   ___ Joint vocational school or Career Center
   ___ Comprehensive city school
   ___ Comprehensive local school
   ___ Other (Please identify)
   _____
   (d) Your Vocational Service Center region.
   ___ Northeast
   ___ Northwest
   ___ Southeast
   ___ Southwest
   ___ Central
   (e) Your teaching assignment.
   ___ Full time
   ___ Part time
   (f) The grade(s) you teach.
   ___ Ninth
   ___ Tenth
   ___ Eleventh
   ___ Twelfth
   ___ Other (Please identify)
   _____

3. Please check the relevant information about your teaching background:
   (a) Your education completed.
   ___ High school diploma
   ___ Associate degree
   ___ Bachelor's degree
   ___ Master's degree
   ___ Educational Specialist degree
   ___ Doctorate
   (b) Your total years of working in education.
   _____years
   (c) Your total years of working in vocational education.
   _____years
   (d) Your total years of working as a vocational evaluator.
   _____years
   (e) Your total years of working as a VOSE coordinator.
   _____years
   (f) Your certificate type
   ___ Substitute
   ___ 1 Yr. Temporary
   ___ 4 Yr. Provisional
   ___ 8 yr. professional
   ___ Permanent

4. Please complete this section about yourself:
   (a) What is your age?_____
   (b) What is your sex?_____
   (c) What is your race?_____

5. Please complete this section which relates to our study in general:
   (a) How many vocational education students are in your building? _____
   (b) How many students with disabilities are in your building?_____
   (c) How many vocational special education coordinators are in your building?_____
   (d) How many students with disabilities do you teach daily?_____
   (e) Have you been trained in special needs education? ___ yes ___ no
   (f) Have you been trained in special education? ___ yes ___ no

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION TRAINING NEED
(Regular and Mainstreamed Students)

The following is a list of action statements covering possible inservice training needs for vocational teachers and special needs coordinators. Will you help us by telling us how important these competencies are to you and what, if any, inservice training you need to better work with both regular and mainstreamed vocational education students?

By mainstreamed students we mean those who have disabilities. They have been in special education classes and have Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) which place them into mainstreamed vocational education programs.

IMPORTANCE					ACTION TASK STATEMENT	NEED-FOR-TRAINING				
No Importance	Little Importance	Some Importance	Considerable Importance	Great Importance		No Need	Little Need	Some Need	Considerable Need	Great Need
					EXAMPLE:					
					A. Conduct open house for:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					1. Define the VOED curriculum for:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					2. Adjust the VOED curriculum for:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					3. Manage the VOED laboratory performance of:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					4. Evaluate the VOED laboratory performance of:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					5. Manage the related class for:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					6. Evaluate the related class for:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					7. Interpret data from tests administered by the psychologist or counselor for:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5

IMPORTANCE					ACTION TASK STATEMENT	NEED-FOR-TRAINING				
No Importance	Little Importance	Some Importance	Considerable Importance	Great Importance		No Need	Little Need	Some Need	Considerable Need	Great Need
					8. Use appropriate instructional procedures in teaching the:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					9. Select VOED instructional materials appropriate for:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					10. Modify VOED instructional materials appropriate for:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					11. Place students in jobs in the community for:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					12. Relate math and science concepts to vocational practice for:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					13. Follow-up on program graduates of:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					14. Motivate students:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					15. Insure appropriate safety practices among:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					16. Grade student work appropriately for:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					17. Develop youth organizational standards for:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					18. Develop appropriate communication skills in:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					19. Control student behavior for:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					20. Manage student behavior for:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					21. Enhance community involvement skills in:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5

IMPORTANCE					ACTION TASK STATEMENT	NEED-FOR TRAINING				
No Importance	Little Importance	Some Importance	Considerable Importance	Great Importance		No Need	Little Need	Some Need	Considerable Need	Great Need
					22. Maintain high standards of vocational performance for:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					23. Process the appropriate paper work and records on:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					24. Develop instructional goals and objectives for:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					25. Adjust the instruction to the learning styles of:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					26. Guide the tutorial services for:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					27. Obtain community services for:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					28. Offer vocational and personal advice to:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					29. Provide an appropriate learning environment for:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					30. Obtain school related support services for:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					31. Visit with the families of:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					32. Test the performance of:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					33. Evaluate the vocational achievement records of:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					34. Develop appropriate vocational goals and objectives for:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5

IMPORTANCE					ACTION TASK STATEMENT	NEED-FOR-TRAINING				
No Importance	Little Importance	Some Importance	Considerable Importance	Great Importance		No Need	Little Need	Some Need	Considerable Need	Great Need
					35. Identify school personnel to accept and work with:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					36. Help the families accept the vocational goals of:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					37. Recruit by using information on the student assessment for:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					38. Interpret data on student records for:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					39. Confer with other professionals about the programs of:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					40. Communicate with the families of:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					41. Understand the teacher liabilities in working with:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					42. Manage the individualized education program (IEP) of learning for:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					43. Apply a variety of learning and teaching techniques during the instruction of:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					44. Develop behavioral objectives for:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					45. Develop the instruction to the individualized differences for:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5
					46. Facilitate cooperative relationships on behalf of:					
1	2	3	4	5	a. typical VOED students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	b. mainstreamed SPED students	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX B

TABLES

Table 1.
MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE 46 ITEMS ON THE VENT INSTRUMENT ON IMPORTANCE-OF-TRAINING FOR BOTH VOED AND SPED STUDENTS. (N=331)

Item Number	MEAN	SD	Item Number	Mean	SD
IMPA1*	4.01	1.01	IMPB1**	4.15	1.04
IMPA2	3.58	1.11	IMPB2	4.10	1.03
IMPA3	3.82	1.06	IMPB3	4.13	1.04
IMPA4	3.90	1.08	IMPB4	4.15	.99
IMPA5	3.80	1.11	IMPB5	4.10	1.05
IMPA6	3.77	1.07	IMPB6	4.03	1.03
IMPA7	3.51	1.08	IMPB7	3.93	1.05
IMPA8	4.07	.96	IMPB8	4.27	.90
IMPA9	4.02	.99	IMPB9	4.24	.93
IMPA10	3.57	1.09	IMPB10	4.15	.96
IMPA11	4.11	1.07	IMPB11	4.22	1.02
IMPA12	4.06	.97	IMPB12	4.12	.99
IMPA13	3.66	1.11	IMPB13	3.75	1.10
IMPA14	4.45	.82	IMPB14	4.48	.83
IMPA15	4.34	.93	IMPB15	4.44	.92
IMPA16	3.97	1.01	IMPB16	4.17	.94
IMPA17	3.58	1.14	IMPB17	3.66	1.15
IMPA18	4.24	.85	IMPB18	4.39	.83
IMPA19	4.15	1.01	IMPB19	4.24	.99
IMPA20	4.12	1.00	IMPB20	4.21	.97
IMPA21	3.92	.97	IMPB21	4.01	.99
IMPA22	4.28	.83	IMPB22	4.22	.89
IMPA23	3.54	.97	IMPB23	3.72	.96
IMPA24	3.93	.99	IMPB24	4.14	.92
IMPA25	4.08	.96	IMPB25	4.39	.85
IMPA26	3.44	1.06	IMPB26	3.92	1.02
IMPA27	3.64	.99	IMPB27	3.90	1.00
IMPA28	3.96	.95	IMPB28	4.06	.94
IMPA29	4.22	.99	IMPB29	4.33	.95
IMPA30	3.91	.97	IMPB30	4.17	.93
IMPA31	3.75	1.13	IMPB31	3.93	1.10
IMPA32	4.04	.92	IMPB32	4.18	.86
IMPA33	3.70	.98	IMPB33	3.82	.99
IMPA34	4.02	.98	IMPB34	4.17	.95
IMPA35	3.67	1.02	IMPB35	3.90	1.05
IMPA36	3.79	.99	IMPB36	3.97	.98
IMPA37	3.83	1.00	IMPB37	4.02	1.02
IMPA38	3.61	1.03	IMPB38	3.80	1.06
IMPA39	3.74	.99	IMPB39	3.99	1.01
IMPA40	3.99	1.01	IMPB40	4.15	.97
IMPA41	4.19	.92	IMPB41	4.32	.89
IMPA42	3.44	1.30	IMPB42	4.11	1.06
IMPA43	4.29	.90	IMPB43	4.42	.84
IMPA44	3.89	1.01	IMPB44	4.10	.97
IMPA45	3.95	1.00	IMPB45	4.22	.94
IMPA46	3.99	.93	IMPB46	4.17	.92

*IMP = Importance-Of-Training; A = Vocational Ed; 1 = Question #1
**IMP = Importance-Of-Training; B = Special Ed; 1 = Question #1
Mean Scale: 1=no; 2=little; 3=some; 4=considerable; 5=great

Table 2.
MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE 46 ITEMS OF THE VENT INSTRUMENT ON NEED-FOR-TRAINING FOR BOTH VOED AND SPED STUDENTS. (N=331).

Item Number	MEAN	SD	Item Number	Mean	SD
*NEEDA1	2.92	1.21	**NEEDB1	3.41	1.22
NEEDA2	2.91	1.20	NEEDB2	3.66	1.18
NEEDA3	3.05	1.24	NEEDB3	3.60	1.20
NEEDA4	3.06	1.22	NEEDB4	3.60	1.17
NEEDA5	2.97	1.25	NEEDB5	3.52	1.24
NEEDA6	2.96	1.21	NEEDB6	3.56	1.21
NEEDA7	3.12	1.21	NEEDB7	3.51	1.18
NEEDA8	3.27	1.15	NEEDB8	3.76	1.10
NEEDA9	3.24	1.17	NEEDB9	3.71	1.10
NEEDA10	3.09	1.18	NEEDB10	3.78	1.12
NEEDA11	3.29	1.28	NEEDB11	3.69	1.24
NEEDA12	3.48	1.24	NEEDB12	3.68	1.19
NEEDA13	2.86	1.23	NEEDB13	3.03	1.29
NEEDA14	3.89	1.16	NEEDB14	3.99	1.12
NEEDA15	3.34	1.23	NEEDB15	3.55	1.23
NEEDA16	3.00	1.28	NEEDB16	3.46	1.30
NEEDA17	2.90	1.23	NEEDB17	3.08	1.29
NEEDA18	3.50	1.11	NEEDB18	3.80	1.12
NEEDA19	3.38	1.27	NEEDB19	3.58	1.27
NEEDA20	3.38	1.26	NEEDB20	3.57	1.26
NEEDA21	3.33	1.14	NEEDB21	3.47	1.17
NEEDA22	3.37	1.19	NEEDB22	3.50	1.15
NEEDA23	2.77	1.15	NEEDB23	3.04	1.20
NEEDA24	3.10	1.21	NEEDB24	3.45	1.20
NEEDA25	3.45	1.27	NEEDB25	3.89	1.15
NEEDA26	3.00	1.18	NEEDB26	3.41	1.18
NEEDA27	3.20	1.11	NEEDB27	3.49	1.12
NEEDA28	3.22	1.19	NEEDB28	3.39	1.21
NEEDA29	3.28	1.23	NEEDB29	3.51	1.24
NEEDA30	3.14	1.16	NEEDB30	3.43	1.17
NEEDA31	2.92	1.30	NEEDB31	3.11	1.34
NEEDA32	3.15	1.21	NEEDB32	3.49	1.18
NEEDA33	3.01	1.14	NEEDB33	3.19	1.18
NEEDA34	3.17	1.21	NEEDB34	3.45	1.22
NEEDA35	2.99	1.21	NEEDB35	3.26	1.29
NEEDA36	3.08	1.18	NEEDB36	3.33	1.23
NEEDA37	3.27	1.25	NEEDB37	3.44	1.22
NEEDA38	2.99	1.19	NEEDB38	3.25	1.24
NEEDA39	3.10	1.22	NEEDB39	3.35	1.26
NEEDA40	3.10	1.24	NEEDB40	3.27	1.26
NEEDA41	3.74	1.19	NEEDB41	3.89	1.17
NEEDA42	3.02	1.34	NEEDB42	3.63	1.27
NEEDA43	3.55	1.28	NEEDB43	3.83	1.25
NEEDA44	3.24	1.27	NEEDB44	3.56	1.23
NEEDA45	3.44	1.20	NEEDB45	3.77	1.21
NEEDA46	3.27	1.22	NEEDB46	3.46	1.23

*NEED = Need-For-Training; A = Vocational Ed; 1 = Question #1
**NEED = Need-For-Training; B = Special Ed; 1 = Question #1
Mean Scale: 1=no; 2=little; 3=some; 4=considerable; 5=great

Table 3.
A COMPARISON OF EDUCATOR RESPONSES "BETWEEN" THE TYPICAL VOED AND THE MAINSTREAMED SPED STUDENTS ON THE TOTAL SCORES, EIGHT FACTORS, AND THREE PROGRAM CLUSTERS.

Variable Importance-Of-Training	Mean	SD	t-Test	Variable Need-For-Training	Mean	SD	t-Test
Total Scores: Importance				Total Scores: Need			
TOTIMPA*	3.90	.65		TOTNEEDA	3.19	.89	
TOTIMPB*	4.11	.65	-7.76***	TOTNEEDB	3.51	.88	-10.58***
Eight Factors: Importance				Eight Factors: Need			
ASSESS1**	3.75	.76		ASSESS3	3.08	.97	
ASSESS2**	3.98	.76	-7.66***	ASSESS4	3.37	.95	-8.74***
COUNREF1	3.78	.75		COUNREF3	3.09	.99	
COUNREF2	3.93	.76	-5.20***	COUNREF4	3.29	1.01	-5.99***
PRGPLC1	3.97	.71		PRGPLC3	3.20	.95	
PRGPLC2	4.14	.73	-5.99***	PRGPLC4	3.48	.97	-8.77***
REMD1	3.92	.89		REMD3	3.15	1.06	
REMD2	4.18	.87	-6.30***	REMD4	3.66	1.02	-10.30***
TUTOR1	4.02	.72		TUTOR3	3.22	.96	
TUTOR2	4.14	.70	-4.28***	TUTOR4	3.52	.91	-8.90***
SPESV1	3.92	.69		SPESV3	3.25	.92	
SPESV2	4.20	.68	-9.20***	SPESV4	3.66	.91	-11.59***
JOBPLC1	3.85	.76		JOBPLC3	3.26	.98	
JOBPLC2	4.02	.76	-6.29***	JOBPLC4	3.47	.98	-7.01***
FOLLOW1	3.86	.78		FOLLOW3	3.05	1.00	
FOLLOW2	4.00	.77	-4.96***	FOLLOW4	3.29	1.03	-7.68***
Three Program Clusters: Importance				Three Program Clusters: Need			
PREPROG1	3.83	.67		PREPROG3	3.12	.92	
PREPROG2	4.02	.69	-6.76***	PREPROG4	3.38	.92	-8.47***
PROGRAM1	3.95	.71		PROGRAM3	3.21	.93	
PROGRAM2	4.17	.70	-7.18***	PROGRAM4	3.61	.89	-11.08***
POSTPRG1	3.85	.71		POSTPRG3	3.16	.94	
POSTPRG2	4.01	.71	-6.02***	POSTPRG4	3.38	.95	-7.86***

df=330, all tests are two-tail. * TOT = Total Scores; IMP = Importance-Of-Training; A = VOED; B = SPED. ** ASSESS = Assessment and Evaluation; 1 = VOED; 2 = SPED; 3 = VOED; 4 = SPED. 1&2 involve Importance; 3&4 involve Need. *** $p < .001$.
Mean Scale: 1=no; 2=little; 3=some; 4=considerable; 5=great

Table 4.
MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF 8 FACTORS AND 3 PROGRAM CLUSTERS OF THE VARIABLES WHICH DETERMINED THE IMPORTANCE-OF-TRAINING AND NEED-FOR-TRAINING FOR BOTH GROUPS OF RESPONSES: VOED AND SPED.

Variables: VOED Group	Mean	SD	Variables: SPED Group	Mean	SD
		IMPORTANCE-OF-TRAINING			
Factors:					
ASSESS1	3.75	.76	ASSESS2	3.98	.76
COUNREF1	3.78	.75	COUNREF2	3.93	.76
PRGPLC1	3.97	.71	PRGPLC2	4.14	.73
REMD1	3.92	.89	REMD2	4.18	.87
TUTOR1	4.02	.72	TUTOR2	4.14	.70
SPESV1	3.92	.69	SPESV2	4.20	.68
JOBPLC1	3.85	.76	JOBPLC2	4.02	.77
FOLLOW1	3.86	.78	FOLLOW2	4.00	.77
Program Clusters:					
PREPROG1	3.83	.67	PREPROG2	4.02	.69
PROGRAM1	3.95	.71	PROGRAM2	4.17	.70
POSTPRG1	3.85	.71	POSTPRG2	4.01	.71
		NEED-FOR-TRAINING			
Factors:					
ASSESS3	3.08	.97	ASSESS4	3.37	.95
COUNREF3	3.09	.99	COUNREF4	3.29	1.01
PRGPLC3	3.20	.95	PRGPLC4	3.48	.97
REMD3	3.15	1.06	REMD4	3.66	1.02
TUTOR3	3.22	.96	TUTOR4	3.52	.91
SPESV3	3.25	.92	SPESV4	3.66	.91
JOBPLC3	3.26	.98	JOBPLC4	3.47	.98
FOLLOW3	3.05	1.00	FOLLOW4	3.29	1.03
Program Clusters:					
PREPROG3	3.12	.92	PREPROG4	3.38	.92
PROGRAM3	3.21	.93	PROGRAM4	3.61	.89
POSTPRG3	3.16	.94	POSTPRG4	3.38	.95

Mean Scale: 1=no; 2=little; 3=some; 4=considerable; 5=great

The eight factors were as follows: Assessment and Evaluation, Counseling and Referral, Program Placement, Remediation, Tutoring, Specialized Service, Job Placement, and Follow-Up. The three service program clusters were: Pre-Program, Program, and Post-Program.

Table 5.
CORRELATION MATRIX OF 8 FACTORS AND 3 PROGRAM CLUSTERS. (N=331)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	11	12
VOED: IMPORTANCE-OF-TRAINING											
Factors:											
ASSESS1*	1.00	.74	.79	.59	.67	.77	.72	.74	.93	.72	.79
COUNREF1		1.00	.68	.54	.62	.66	.64	.62	.89	.65	.68
PRGPLC1			1.00	.68	.77	.85	.73	.76	.90	.82	.81
REMD1				1.00	.75	.75	.54	.60	.66	.92	.62
TUTOR1					1.00	.86	.65	.74	.75	.93	.76
SPESV1						1.00	.75	.77	.83	.93	.83
JOBPLC1							1.00	.70	.76	.69	.92
FOLLOW1								1.00	.77	.75	.93
Program Clusters:											
PREPROG1									1.00	.80	.83
PROGRAM1										1.00	.78
POSTPRG1											1.00
SPED: IMPORTANCE-OF-TRAINING											
Factors:											
ASSESS2	1.00	.76	.82	.59	.68	.79	.73	.76	.93	.72	.80
COUNREF2		1.00	.75	.58	.63	.71	.70	.65	.91	.67	.72
PRGPLC2			1.00	.70	.77	.86	.76	.78	.93	.82	.83
REMD2				1.00	.78	.79	.64	.62	.67	.93	.68
TUTOR2					1.00	.87	.71	.74	.75	.94	.78
SPESV2						1.00	.79	.77	.85	.94	.84
JOBPLC2							1.00	.73	.79	.76	.93
FOLLOW2								1.00	.79	.75	.93
Program Clusters:											
PREPROG2									1.00	.80	.85
PROGRAM2										1.00	.81
POSTPRG2											1.00
VOED: NEED-FOR-TRAINING											
Factors:											
ASSESS3	1.00	.84	.86	.67	.80	.84	.78	.84	.95	.81	.85
COUNREF3		1.00	.84	.64	.75	.78	.78	.82	.95	.76	.84
PRGPLC3			1.00	.73	.85	.88	.79	.86	.95	.86	.87
REMD3				1.00	.79	.81	.57	.68	.72	.93	.66
TUTOR3					1.00	.92	.74	.84	.84	.95	.83
SPESV3						1.00	.78	.86	.88	.96	.86
JOBPLC3							1.00	.80	.83	.73	.95
FOLLOW3								1.00	.89	.83	.95
Program Clusters:											
PREPROG3									1.00	.86	.90
PROGRAM3										1.00	.83
POSTPRG3											1.00

Table 5. cont'd--

CORRELATION MATRIX FOR 8 FACTORS AND 3 PROGRAM CLUSTERS. (N=331)

SPED: NEED-FOR-TRAINING

Factors:											
ASSESS4	1.00	.83	.86	.66	.80	.84	.77	.83	.95	.81	.85
COUNREF4		1.00	.81	.58	.74	.75	.76	.80	.94	.73	.82
PRGPLC4			1.00	.70	.83	.88	.80	.85	.94	.85	.87
REMD4				1.00	.78	.79	.58	.65	.68	.92	.65
TUTOR4					1.00	.90	.76	.83	.84	.95	.84
SPESV4						1.00	.79	.83	.87	.95	.86
JOBPLC4							1.00	.80	.82	.75	.95
FOLLOW4								1.00	.88	.81	.95
Program Clusters:											
PREPROG4									1.00	.85	.90
PROGRAM4										1.00	.83
POSTPRG4											1.00

* ASSESS1: ASSESS=Assessment and Evaluation; 1=VOED; 2=SPED; 3=VOED; and 4=SPED. #1 & #2 involve the Importance-Of-Training comparisons while #3 & #4 involve Need-For-Training comparisons.

Table 6.
SUMMARY OF ANOVA ON THE FACTOR OF ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION BY DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

Source	df	SS	MS	F
		**#ASSESS2 By Service Area		
Between	8	11.29	1.41	2.54*
Within	308	171.37	.56	
		ASSESS4 By Educational Level		
Between	2	6.18	3.09	3.43*
Within	285	256.62	.30	
		ASSESS2 By Number of Coordinators		
Between	5	8.97	1.79	3.28**
Within	268	146.67	.55	
		ASSESS4 By Number of Coordinators		
Between	5	10.97	2.19	2.50*
Within	268	235.28	.88	
		ASSESS2 By Training in Special Education		
Between	1	2.34	2.34	4.20*
Within	298	166.69	.56	

* p<.05
** p<.01
*** p<.001
** ASSESS2: ASSESS=Assessment and Evaluation; 1 and 3 = VOED; 2 and 4 = SPED; 1 and 2 also represent the domain Importance-Of-Training while 3 and 4 represent the domain Need-For-Training.
NOTE: Only variables with significance levels of p<.05 were included.

Table 7.
SUMMARY OF ANOVA ON THE FACTOR OF COUNSELING AND REFERRAL BY DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

Source	df	SS	MS	F
		**#COUNREF2 By Service Area		
Between	8	11.49	1.44	2.51*
Within	308	176.29	.57	
		COUNREF2 By School Type		
Between	3	5.69	1.90	3.33*
Within	308	175.42	.57	
		COUNREF1 By Educational Level		
Between	2	7.62	3.81	7.06***
Within	285	153.92	.54	
		COUNREF2 By Educational Level		
Between	2	8.74	4.37	7.78***
Within	285	159.99	.56	
		COUNREF3 By Educational Level		
Between	2	9.69	4.84	5.06**
Within	285	272.83	.96	
		COUNREF4 By Educational Level		
Between	2	13.63	6.82	6.87***
Within	285	282.95	.99	
		COUNREF4 By Certificate Type		
Between	3	8.66	2.89	2.87*
Within	297	298.56	1.01	

* p<.05
** p<.01
*** p<.001
** COUNREF=Counseling and Referral; 1 and 3 = VOED; 2 and 4 = SPED; 1 and 2 also represent the domain Importance-Of-Training while 3 and 4 represent the domain Need-For-Training.
NOTE: Only variables with significance levels of p<.05 were included.

Table 8.
SUMMARY OF ANOVA ON THE FACTOR PROGRAM PLACEMENT
BY DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND VARIABLES

Source	df	SS	MS	F
	**PROGPLC2 By Service Area			
Between	8	11.83	1.48	2.91**
Within	308	156.75	.51	
	PROGPLC2 By School Type			
Between	3	9.29	3.10	5.99***
Within	308	159.20	.52	
	PROGPLC2 By Sex			
Between	1	5.12	5.12	9.98**
Within	325	166.68	.51	
	PROGPLC3 By Education Level			
Between	2	5.53	2.77	3.17*
Within	285	248.94	.87	
	PROGPLC2 By Total Years in Education			
Between	5	7.61	1.52	2.95**
Within	292	150.88	.52	
	PROGPLC2 By Years in Vocational Education			
Between	4	5.21	1.30	2.51*
Within	289	150.19	.52	
	PROGPLC2 By Number of Coordinator			
Between	5	6.37	1.27	2.43*
Within	268	140.45	.52	

* p<.05
** p<.01
*** p<.001
** PROGPLC2: PROGPLC=Program Placement; 1 and 3 = VOED; 2 and 4 = SPED; 1 and 2 also represent the domain Importance-Of-Training while 3 and 4 represent the domain Need-For-Training.
NOTE: Only variables with significance levels of p<.05 were included.

Table 9.
SUMMARY OF THE ANOVA ON THE FACTOR REMEDIAL
BY TEACHERS' DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND VARIABLES

Source	df	SS	MS	F
		**Remd2 By Service Area		
Between	8	19.12	2.39	3.31
Within	308	222.40	.72	
		Remd4 By Service Area		
Between	8	19.16	2.40	2.33*
Within	308	317.04	1.03	
		Remd2 By School Type		
Between	3	9.02	3.01	4.06
Within	308	228.13	.74	
		Remd4 By School Type		
Between	3	12.66	4.22	4.01**
Within	308	318.32	1.03	
		Remd2 By Sex		
Between	1	3.82	3.82	5.15*
Within	325	240.97	.74	
		Remd3 By Sex		
Between	1	7.19	7.19	6.51**
Within	325	358.87	1.10	
		Remd2 By Grade Level		
Between	2	6.21	3.11	4.18*
Within	182	135.33	.74	
		Remd2 By Total Years in Ed.		
Between	5	12.18	2.44	3.27**
Within	292	217.59	.75	
		Remd2 By Number of Coordinator		
Between	5	9.94	1.99	2.65*
Within	268	201.50	.75	
		Remd4 By Number of Coordinator		
Between	5	11.91	2.38	2.23*
Within	268	286.50	1.07	

* p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001
*# REMD2: REMD=Remediation; 1 and 3 = VOED; 2 and 4 = SPED; 1 and 2 also represents the domain Importance-Of-Training while 3 and 4 represent the domain Need-For-Training.
NOTE: Variables with significance levels of p<.05 were included.

Table 10.
SUMMARY OF THE ANOVA ON THE FACTOR TUTORING SUPPORT
BY TEACHERS' DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND VARIABLES

Source	df	SS	MS	F
		**#Tutor1 By Job Title		
Between	3	7.03	2.35	4.65**
Within	327	165.09	.51	
		Tutor2 By Job Title		
Between	3	5.63	1.88	3.90**
Within	327	157.11	.48	
		Tutor3 By Job Title		
Between	3	7.76	2.59	2.88*
Within	327	43.81	.90	
		Tutor4 By Job Title		
Between	3	8.83	2.94	3.62*
Within	327	265.96	.81	
		Tutor2 By Service Area		
Between	8	8.60	1.08	2.23*
Within	308	148.66	.48	
		Tutor4 By Service Area		
Between	8	14.41	1.80	2.22*
Within	308	249.47	.81	
		Tutor1 By School Type		
Between	3	5.09	1.70	3.42*
Within	308	152.80	.50	
		Tutor2 By School Type		
Between	3	17.175	2.58	5.36***
Within	308	150.08	.49	
		Tutor3 By School Type		
Between	3	7.04	2.35	2.63*
Within	308	274.72	.89	
		Tutor4 By School Type		
Between	3	8.37	2.79	3.33*
Within	308	218.53	.84	
		Tutor2 By Sex		
Between	1	1.91	1.91	3.93*
Within	325	158.27	.49Table 10 Continue	
		Tutor2 By Teach Disabilities		
Between	1	2.22	2.22	4.13*
Within	250	134.68	.54	

* p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001
** TUTOR1: TUTOR=Tutoring Support; 1 and 3 = VOED; 2 and 4 = SPED; 1 and 2 also represent the domain Importance-Of-Training while 3 and 4 represent the domain Need-For-Training.
NOTE: Only variables with significance levels of p<.05 were included.

Table 11.
SUMMARY OF THE ANOVA ON THE FACTOR SPECIAL SERVICES
BY TEACHERS' DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND VARIABLES

Source	df	SS	MS	F
	**Spesv1 By Job Title			
Between	3	5.09	1.70	3.69*
Within	327	150.30	.46	
	Spesv2 By Job Title			
Between	3	3.91	1.30	2.99*
Within	327	146.97	.45	
	Spesv2 By Service Area			
Between	3	13.45	1.68	3.87***
Within	308	133.81	.43	
	Spesv4 By Service Area			
Between	3	16.55	2.07	2.63**
Within	308	242.28	.79	
	Spesv2 By School Type			
Between	3	8.02	2.67	5.88***
Within	308	139.89	.45	
	Spesv4 By School Type			
Between	3	7.12	2.37	2.87*
Within	308	255.66	.83	
	Spesv2 By Sex			
Between	1	4.28	4.28	9.55**
Within	325	145.52	.45	
	Spesv4 By Sex			
Between	1	4.93	4.93	6.18*
Within	325	259.27	.80	
	Spesv2 By Total Years in Ed.			
Between	5	5.35	1.07	2.34*
Within	292	133.91	.46	
	Spesv2 By Number of Coordinator			
Between	5	9.16	1.83	4.16**
Within	268	117.88	.44	
	Spesv4 By Number of Coordinator			
Between	5	10.52	2.10	2.67*
Within	268	210.81	.79	
	Spesv2 By Trained in Special Need Ed.			
Between	1	2.75	2.75	6.00*
Within	298	136.57	.46	
	Spesv2 By Trained Special Ed.			
Between	1	4.6	4.16	9.18**
Within	299	135.36	.45	

* p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001
** SPESV1: SPESV=Special Services; 1 and 3 = VOED; 2 and 4 = SPED; 1 and 2 also represent the domain Importance-Of-Training while 3 and 4 represent the domain Need-For-Training.
NOTE: Only variables with significance levels of p<.05 were included.

Table 12.
SUMMARY OF THE ANOVA ON THE FACTOR JOB PLACEMENT
BY TEACHERS' DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND VARIABLES

Source	df	SS	MS	F
	**Jobplc2 By Service Area			
Between	8	10.03	1.25	2.14*
Within	308	180.10	.58	
	Jobplc2 By School Type			
Between	3	9.21	3.07	5.31**
Within	308	178.05	.58	
	Jobplc4 By Education Level			
Between	2	6.63	3.31	3.44*
Within	285	273.18	.96	
	Jobplc2 By Number of Coordinator			
Between	5	7.05	1.41	2.42*
Within	268	156.45	.58	
	Jobplc2 By Trained in Special Need Ed.			
Between	1	3.30	3.30	5.64*
Within	298	174.32	.59	
	Jobplc2 By Trained in Special Ed.			
Between	1	3.40	3.40	5.80*
Within	299	175.20	.59	

* p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001
** JOBPLC2: JOBPLC=Job Placement; 1 and 3 = VOED; 2 and 4 = SPED; 1 and 2 also represent the domain Importance-Of-Training while 3 and 4 represent the domain Need-For-Training.
NOTE: Only variables with significance levels of p<.05 were included.

Table 13.
SUMMARY OF THE ANOVA ON THE PRE-PROGRAM CLUSTER BY TEACHERS' DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND VARIABLES

Source	df	SS	MS	F
	**Preprog2 By Service Area			
Between	8	10.28	1.28	2.78**
Within	308	142.13	.46	
	Preprog2 By School Type			
Between	3	6.16	2.05	4.36**
Within	308	145.07	.47	
	Preprog2 By Sex			
Between	1	2.38	2.38	5.05*
Within	325	153.09	.47	
	Preprog2 By Education Level			
Between	2	2.84	1.42	3.04*
Within	285	133.30	.47	
	Preprog3 By Education Level			
Between	2	6.29	3.15	3.89*
Within	285	230.68	.81	
	Preprog4 By Education Level			
Between	2	7.54	3.77	4.52*
Within	285	237.66	.83	
	Preprog2 By Number of Coordinator			
Between	5	5.46	1.09	2.35*
Within	268	124.50	.47	
	Preprog4 By Number of Coordinator			
Between	5	9.67	1.94	2.38*
Within	268	217.86	.81	

* p<.05
** p<.01
*** p<.001
**PREPROG2: PREPROG=Pre-Program Cluster; 1 and 3 = VOED; 2 and 4 = SPED; 1 and 2 also represents the domain Importance-Of-Training while 3 and 4 represent the domain Need-For-Training.
NOTE: Only variables with significance levels of p<.05 were included.

Table 14.
SUMMARY OF THE ANOVA ON THE PROGRAM CLUSTER
BY TEACHERS' DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND VARIABLES

Source	df	SS	MS	F
		**Program1 By Job Title		
Between	3	4.86	1.62	3.30*
Within	327	160.50	.49	
		Program2 By Service Area		
Between	8	12.26	1.53	3.25**
Within	308	145.38	.47	
		Program4 By Service Area		
Between	8	15.68	1.96	2.57**
Within	308	234.98	.76	
		Program2 By School Type		
Between	3	7.84	2.61	5.38**
Within	308	149.59	.49	
		Program4 By School Type		
Between	3	8.47	2.82	3.57*
Within	308	243.92	.79	
		Program2 By Sex		
Between	1	3.25	2.25	6.75**
Within	325	156.28	.48	
		Program2 By Total Years in Ed.		
Between	5	6.96	1.39	2.84*
Within	292	143.38	.49	
		Program2 By Number of Coordinator		
Between	5	6.98	1.40	2.87*
Within	268	130.35	.49	
		Program4 By Number of Coordinator		
Between	5	8.72	1.74	2.25*
Within	268	207.57	.78	
		Program2 By Trained in Special Ed.		
Between	1	1.95	1.95	3.93*
Within	299	148.53	.50	

* p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001
**PROGRAM1: PROGRAM=Program Cluster; 1 and 3 = VOED; 2 and 4 = SPED; 1 and 2 also represent the domain Importance-Of-Training while 3 and 4 represent the domain Need-For-Training.
NOTE: Only variables with significance levels of p<.05 were included.

Table 15.
SUMMARY OF THE ANOVA ON THE POST-PROGRAM CLUSTER
BY TEACHERS' DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND VARIABLES

Source	df	SS	MS	F
	**Postprg2 By School Type			
Between	3	7.19	2.40	4.72**
Within	308	156.43	.51	
	Postprg2 By Sex			
Between	1	2.38	2.38	4.71*
Within	325	163.97	.51	
	Postprg3 By Education Level			
Between	2	5.62	2.81	3.33*
Within	285	240.60	.84	
	Postprg4 By Education Level			
Between	2	6.70	3.35	3.76*
Within	285	254.10	.89	
	Postprg2 By Total Years in Ed.			
Between	5	5.84	1.17	2.30*
Within	292	148.36	.51	
	Postprg2 By Number of Coordinator			
Between	5	8.85	1.77	3.55**
Within	268	133.78	.50	
	Postprg4 By Number of Coordinator			
Between	5	11.76	2.35	2.71*
Within	268	232.47	.87	
	Postprg2 By Trained in Special Need Ed.			
Between	1	3.14	3.14	6.16*
Within	298	152.09	.51	
	Postprg2 By Trained in Special Ed.			
Between	1	2.37	2.37	4.63*
Within	299	152.90	.51	

* p<.05
** p<.01
*** p<.001
** POSTPRG2: POSTPRG=Post-Program Cluster; 1 and 3 = VOED; 2 and 4 = SPED; 1 and 2 also represents the domain Importance-Of-Training while 3 and 4 represent the domain Need-For-Training.
NOTE: Only variables with significance levels of p<.05 were included.

Table 16.
SUMMARY OF THE ANOVA ON THE TOTAL VENT MEASURES
BY TEACHERS' DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND VARIABLES

Source	df	SS	MS	F
	**#Totimpa By Job Title			
Between	3	3.27	1.09	2.62*
Within	327	136.09	.42	
	Totimpb By Service Area			
Between	8	9.58	1.20	2.90**
Within	308	127.31	.41	
	Totneedb By Service Area			
Between	8	12.33	1.54	2.07*
Within	308	229.45	.75	
	Totimpb By School Type			
Between	3	7.10	2.37	5.60***
Within	308	130.08	.42	
	Totimpb By Sex			
Between	1	3.02	3.02	7.20**
Within	325	136.02	.42	
	Totneedb By Education Level			
Between	2	5.05	2.53	3.35*
Within	285	214.59	.75	
	Totimpb By Total Years in Ed.			
Between	5	4.90	.98	2.30*
Within	292	124.35	.43	
	Totimpb By Number of Coordinator			
Between	5	7.10	1.42	3.44**
Within	268	110.65	.41	
	Totneedb By Number of Coordinator			
Between	5	9.79	1.96	2.68*
Within	268	196.15	.73	
	Totimpb By Trained in Special Need Ed.			
Between	1	1.99	1.99	4.66*
Within	298	127.49	.43	
	Totimpb By Trained in Special Ed.			
Between	1	2.24	2.24	5.26*
Within	299	127.31	.43	

* p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001
*# TOTIMPA: TOTIMP=Total Group/Importance-Of-Training; a = VOED; b = SPED; NEED = Need-For-Training.
NOTE: Only variables with significance of p<.05 were included.

Table 17.

MEAN SCORE COMPARISONS OF IMPORTANCE-OF-TRAINING FOR VOED AND SPED STUDENTS BY "VENT" MEASURE

NO.	DEFINITION	(VOED) MEAN	(SPED) MEAN
1.	Defining VOED curriculum	4.01	4.15
2.	Adjusting VOED curriculum	3.58	4.10
3.	Managing VOED laboratory	3.82	4.13
4.	Evaluating VOED laboratory	3.90	4.15
5.	Managing related class	3.80	4.10
6.	Evaluating related class	3.77	4.03
7.	Interpreting test data	3.51	3.93
8.	Using appropriate instruction	4.07	4.27
9.	Selecting VOED materials	4.02	4.24
10.	Modifying VOED instruction	3.57	4.15
11.	Placing students in community jobs	4.11	4.22
12.	Relating math and science	4.06	4.12
13.	Follow-up of graduates	3.66	3.75
14.	Motivating students	4.45	4.48
15.	Insuring appropriate safety	4.34	4.44
16.	Grading student work	3.97	4.17
17.	Developing youth organizations	3.58	3.66
18.	Developing communication skills	4.24	4.39
19.	Controlling student behavior	4.15	4.24
20.	Managing student behavior	4.12	4.21
21.	Enhancing community involvement	3.92	4.01
22.	Maintaining high standards	4.28	4.22
23.	Processing appropriate records	3.54	3.72
24.	Developing goals and objectives	3.93	4.14
25.	Adjusting to learning styles	4.08	4.39
26.	Guiding tutorial services	3.44	3.92
27.	Obtaining community services	3.64	3.90
28.	Offering advice	3.96	4.06
29.	Providing learning environment	4.22	4.33
30.	Obtaining school related support	3.91	4.17
31.	Visiting with families	3.75	3.93
32.	Testing performance	4.04	4.18
33.	Evaluating achievement records	3.70	3.82
34.	Developing vocational goals	4.02	4.17
35.	Identifying school personnel	3.67	3.90
36.	Helping families with goals	3.79	3.97
37.	Recruiting through assessment	3.83	4.02
38.	Interpreting student records	3.61	3.80
39.	Conferring with professionals	3.74	3.99
40.	Communicating with families	3.99	4.15
41.	Understanding liabilities	4.19	4.32
42.	Managing the IEP	3.44	4.11
43.	Applying variety to techniques	4.29	4.42
44.	Developing behavioral objectives	3.89	4.10
45.	Instructing to individual differences	3.95	4.22
46.	Facilitating cooperative relationships	3.99	4.17

Scale: 1-no(importance); 2-little; 3-some; 4-considerable; 5-great

N=331

Table 18.

MEAN SCORE COMPARISONS OF NEED-FOR-TRAINING FOR VOED AND SPED STUDENTS BY "VENT" MEASURE

NO.	DEFINITION	(VOED) MEAN	(SPED) MEAN
1.	Defining VOED curriculum	2.92	3.41
2.	Adjusting VOED curriculum	2.91	3.66
3.	Managing VOED laboratory	3.05	3.60
4.	Evaluating VOED laboratory	3.06	3.60
5.	Managing related class	2.97	3.52
6.	Evaluating related class	2.96	3.56
7.	Interpreting test data	3.12	3.51
8.	Using appropriate instruction	3.27	3.76
9.	Selecting VOED materials	3.24	3.71
10.	Modifying VOED instruction	3.09	3.78
11.	Placing students in community jobs	3.29	3.69
12.	Relating math and science	3.48	3.68
13.	Follow-up of graduates	2.86	3.03
14.	Motivating students	3.89	3.99
15.	Insuring appropriate safety	3.34	3.55
16.	Grading student work	3.00	3.46
17.	Developing youth organizations	2.90	3.08
18.	Developing communication skills	3.50	3.80
19.	Controlling student behavior	3.38	3.58
20.	Managing student behavior	3.38	3.58
21.	Enhancing community involvement	3.33	3.47
22.	Maintaining high standards	3.37	3.50
23.	Processing appropriate records	2.77	3.04
24.	Developing goals and objectives	3.10	3.45
25.	Adjusting to learning styles	3.45	3.89
26.	Guiding tutorial services	3.00	3.41
27.	Obtaining community services	3.20	3.49
28.	Offering advice	3.22	3.39
29.	Providing learning environment	3.28	3.51
30.	Obtaining school related support	3.14	4.43
31.	Visiting with families	2.92	3.11
32.	Testing performance	3.15	3.49
33.	Evaluating achievement records	3.01	3.19
34.	Developing vocational goals	3.17	3.45
35.	Identifying school personnel	2.99	3.26
36.	Helping families with goals	3.08	3.33
37.	Recruiting through assessment	3.27	3.44
38.	Interpreting student records	2.99	3.25
39.	Conferring with professionals	3.10	3.35
40.	Communicating with families	3.10	3.27
41.	Understanding liabilities	3.74	3.89
42.	Managing the IEP	3.02	3.63
43.	Applying variety to techniques	3.55	3.83
44.	Developing behavioral objectives	3.24	3.56
45.	Instructing to individual differences	3.44	3.77
46.	Facilitating cooperative relationships	3.27	3.46

Scale: 1-no(importance); 2-little; 3-some; 4-considerable; 5-great

N=331

Table 19.
RANK ORDER OF MEAN SCORES ON IMPORTANCE-OF-TRAINING FOR TEACHERS OF VOED STUDENTS

RANK	VETN NO.	DEFINITION	VOED MEAN
1	14.	Motivating students	4.45
2	15.	Insuring appropriate safety	4.34
3	43.	Applying variety to techniques	4.29
4	22.	Maintaining high standards	4.28
5	18.	Developing communication skills	4.24
6	29.	Providing learning environment	4.22
7	41.	Understanding liabilities	4.19
8	19.	Controlling student behavior	4.15
9	20.	Managing student behavior	4.12
10	11.	Placing students in community jobs	4.11
11	25.	Adjusting to learning styles	4.08
12	8.	Using appropriate instruction	4.07
13	12.	Relating math and science	4.06
14	32.	Testing performance	4.04
15	9.	Selecting VOED materials	4.02
16	34.	Developing vocational goals	4.02
17	1.	Define VOED curriculum	4.01
18	40.	Communicating with families	3.99
19	46.	Facilitating cooperative relationships	3.99
20	16.	Grading student work	3.97
21	28.	Offering advice	3.96
22	45.	Instructing to individual differences	3.95
23	24.	Developing goals and objectives	3.93
24	21.	Enhancing community involvement	3.92
25	30.	Obtaining school related support	3.91
26	4.	Evaluating VOED laboratory	3.90
27	44.	Developing behavioral objectives	3.89
28	37.	Recruiting through assessment	3.83
29	3.	Managing VOED laboratory	3.82
30	5.	Managing related class	3.80
31	36.	Helping families with goals	3.79
32	6.	Evaluating related class	3.77
33	31.	Visiting with families	3.75
34	39.	Conferring with professionals	3.74
35	33.	Evaluating achievement records	3.70
36	35.	Identifying school personnel	3.67
37	13.	Following-up graduates	3.66
38	27.	Obtaining community services	3.64
39	38.	Interpreting student records	3.61
40	2.	Adjusting VOED curriculum	3.58
41	17.	Developing youth organizations	3.58
42	10.	Modifying VOED instruction	3.57
43	23.	Processing appropriate records	3.54
44	7.	Interpreting test data	3.51
45	42.	Managing the IEP	3.44
46	26.	Guiding tutorial services	3.44

Scale: 1-no(importance); 2-little; 3-Some; 4-considerable; and 5-great. N=331

Table 20.
RANK ORDER OF MEAN SCORES ON IMPORTANCE-OF-TRAINING FOR TEACHERS OF SPED STUDENTS

RANK	VETN NO.	DEFINITION	SPED MEAN
1	14.	Motivating students	4.48
2	15.	Insuring appropriate safety	4.44
3	43.	Applying variety to techniques	4.42
4	18.	Developing communication skills	4.39
5	25.	Adjusting to learning styles	4.39
6	29.	Providing learning environment	4.33
7	41.	Understanding liabilities	4.32
8	8.	Using appropriate instruction	4.27
9	9.	Selecting VOED materials	4.24
10	19.	Controlling student behavior	4.24
11	11.	Placing students in community jobs	4.22
12	22.	Maintaining high standards	4.22
13	45.	Instructing to individual differences	4.22
14	20.	Managing student behavior	4.21
15	32.	Testing performance	4.18
16	16.	Grading student work	4.17
17	30.	Obtaining school related support	4.17
18	34.	Developing vocational goals	4.17
19	46.	Facilitating cooperative relationships	4.17
20	1.	Define VOED curriculum	4.15
21	4.	Evaluating VOED laboratory	4.15
22	10.	Modifying VOED instruction	4.15
23	40.	Communicating with families	4.15
24	24.	Developing goals and objectives	4.14
25	3.	Managing VOED laboratory	4.13
26	12.	Relating math and science	4.12
27	42.	Managing the IEP	4.11
28	2.	Adjusting VOED curriculum	4.10
29	5.	Managing related class	4.10
30	44.	Developing behavioral objectives	4.10
31	28.	Offering advice	4.06
32	6.	Evaluating related class	4.03
33	37.	Recruiting through assessment	4.02
34	21.	Enhancing community involvement	4.01
35	39.	Conferring with professionals	3.99
36	36.	Helping families with goals	3.97
37	7.	Interpreting test data	3.93
38	31.	Visiting with families	3.93
39	26.	Guiding tutorial services	3.92
40	27.	Obtaining community services	3.90
41	35.	Identifying school personnel	3.90
42	33.	Evaluating achievement records	3.82
43	38.	Interpreting student records	3.80
44	13.	Following-up graduates	3.75
45	23.	Processing appropriate records	3.72
46	17.	Developing youth organizations	3.66

Scale: 1-no(importance); 2-little; 3-some; 4-considerable; and 5-great
N=331

Table 21.
RANK ORDER OF MEAN SCORES ON NEED-FOR-TRAINING FOR TEACHERS OF VOED STUDENTS

RANK	VETN NO.	DEFINITION	VOED MEAN
1	14.	Motivating students	3.89
2	41.	Understanding liabilities	3.74
3	43.	Applying variety to techniques	3.55
4	18.	Developing communication skills	3.50
5	12.	Relating math and science	3.48
6	25.	Adjusting to learning styles	3.45
7	45.	Instructing to individual differences	3.44
8	19.	Controlling student behavior	3.38
9	20.	Managing student behavior	3.38
10	22.	Maintaining high standards	3.37
11	15.	Insuring appropriate safety	3.34
12	21.	Enhancing community involvement	3.33
13	11.	Placing students in community jobs	3.29
14	29.	Providing appropriate learning	3.28
15	8.	Using appropriate instruction	3.27
16	37.	Recruiting through assessment	3.27
17	46.	Facilitating cooperative relationships	3.27
18	9.	Selecting VOED materials	3.24
19	44.	Developing behavioral objectives	3.24
20	28.	Offering advice	3.22
21	27.	Obtaining community services	3.20
22	34.	Developing vocational goals	3.17
23	32.	Testing performance	3.15
24	30.	Obtaining school related support	3.14
25	7.	Interpreting test data	3.12
26	24.	Developing goals and objectives	3.10
27	39.	Conferring with professionals	3.10
28	40.	Communicating with families	3.10
29	10.	Modifying VOED instruction	3.09
30	36.	Helping families with goals	3.08
31	4.	Evaluating the VOED laboratory	3.06
32	3.	Managing the VOED laboratory	3.05
33	42.	Managing the IEP	3.02
34	33.	Evaluating achievement records	3.01
35	16.	Grading student work	3.00
36	26.	Guiding tutorial services	3.00
37	35.	Identifying school personnel	2.99
38	38.	Interpreting student records	2.99
39	5.	Managing related classes	2.97
40	6.	Evaluating related class	2.96
41	1.	Defining VOED curriculum	2.92
42	31.	Visiting with families	2.92
43	2.	Adjusting VOED curriculum	2.91
44	17.	Developing youth organizations	2.90
45	13.	Following-up graduates	2.86
46	23.	Processing appropriate records	2.77

Scale: 1-no(need); 2-little; 3-some; 4-considerable; and 5-great N=331

Table 22.
RANK ORDER OF MEAN SCORES ON NEED-FOR-TRAINING FOR TEACHERS OF SPED STUDENTS

RANK		DEFINITION	SPED MEAN
1	14.	Motivating students	3.99
2	25.	Adjusting to learning styles	3.89
3	41.	Understanding liabilities	3.89
4	43.	Applying variety to techniques	3.83
5	18.	Developing communication skills	3.80
6	10.	Modifying VOED instruction	3.78
7	45.	Instructing to individual differences	3.77
8	8.	Using appropriate instruction	3.76
9	9.	Selecting VOED materials	3.71
10	11.	Placing students in community jobs	3.69
11	12.	Relating math and science	3.68
12	2.	Adjusting the VOED curriculum	3.66
13	42.	Managing the IEP	3.63
14	3.	Managing the VOED laboratory	3.60
15	4.	Evaluating the VOED laboratory	3.60
16	19.	Controlling student behavior	3.58
17	20.	Managing student behavior	3.57
18	6.	Evaluating the related classes	3.56
19	44.	Developing behavioral objectives	3.56
20	15.	Insuring appropriate safety	3.55
21	5.	Managing related classes	3.52
22	7.	Interpreting test data	3.51
23	29.	Providing appropriate learning	3.51
24	22.	Maintaining high standards	3.50
25	27.	Obtaining community services	3.49
26	32.	Testing performance	3.49
27	21.	Enhancing community involvement	3.47
28	16.	Grading student work	3.46
29	46.	Facilitating cooperative relationships	3.46
30	24.	Developing goals and objectives	3.45
31	34.	Developing vocational goals	3.45
32	37.	Recruiting through assessment	3.44
33	30.	Obtaining school related support	3.43
34	1.	Defining VOED curriculum	3.41
35	26.	Guiding tutorial services	3.41
36	28.	Offering advice	3.39
37	39.	Conferring with professionals	3.35
38	36.	Helping families with goals	3.33
39	40.	Communicating with families	3.27
40	35.	Identifying school personnel	3.26
41	38.	Interpreting student records	3.25
42	33.	Evaluating achievement records	3.19
43	31.	Visiting with families	3.11
44	17.	Developing youth organizations	3.08
45	23.	Processing appropriate records	3.04
46	13.	Following-up on graduates	3.03

Scale: 1-no(need); 2-little; 3-some; 4-considerable; and 5-great N=331

Table 23.
CATEGORICAL LIST OF VETN ITEMS FOR THE THREE MAJOR PROGRAM AREAS AND THE EIGHT FACTORS

Number	Definition
PRE-PROGRAM SERVICES	
	Assessment and Evaluation
7.	Interpreting test data
30.	Obtaining school related support
32.	Testing performance
33.	Evaluating achievement records
38.	Interpreting student records
	Counseling and Referral
23.	Processing appropriate records
28.	Offering advice
37.	Recruiting through assessment
	Program Placement
1.	Defining VOED curriculum
29.	Providing learning environment
34.	Developing vocational goals
35.	Identifying school personnel
39.	Conferring with professionals
41.	Understanding liabilities
PROGRAM SERVICES	
	Remediation
3.	Managing the VOED laboratory
9.	Selecting VOED materials
	Tutoring
5.	Managing related class
8.	Using appropriate instruction
12.	Relating math and science
15.	Insuring appropriate safety
17.	Developing youth organizations
22.	Maintaining high standards
	Specialized Service
2.	Adjusting VOED curriculum
4.	Evaluating VOED laboratory
6.	Evaluating related classes
10.	Modifying VOED instruction
14.	Motivating students
16.	Grading student work
18.	Developing communication skills
19.	Controlling student behavior
20.	Managing student behavior
24.	Developing goals and objectives
25.	Adjusting to learning styles
26.	Guiding tutorial services
42.	Managing the IEP
43.	Applying variety to techniques
44.	Developing behaviorial objectives
45.	Instructing to individual differences

Table 23. Cont'd--

POST-PROGRAM SERVICES

Job Placement

21. Enhancing community involvement
27. Obtaining community serivces
46. Facilitating cooperative relationships

Follow-Up

11. Placing students in community jobs
13. Follow-up of graduates
31. Visiting with families
36. Helping families with goals
40. Communicating with families

Table 24.
CATEGORICAL LIST OF IMPORTANCE-OF-TRAINING MEAN SCORES BY THE THREE MAJOR PROGRAM AREAS AND THE EIGHT FACTORS

Number	Definition	Importance-Of-Training VOED MEAN	SPED MEAN
PRE-PROGRAM SERVICES			
	Assessment and Evaluation		
7.	Interpreting test data	3.51	3.93
30.	Obtaining school related support	3.91	4.17
32.	Testing performance	4.04	4.18
33.	Evaluating achievement records	3.70	3.82
38.	Interpreting student records	3.61	3.80
	Counseling and Referral		
23.	Processing appropriate records	3.54	3.72
28.	Offering advice	3.96	4.06
37.	Recruiting through assessment	3.83	4.02
	Program Placement		
1.	Defining VOED curriculum	4.01	4.15
29.	Providing learning environment	4.22	4.33
34.	Developing vocational goals	4.02	4.17
35.	Identifying school personnel	3.67	3.90
39.	Conferring with professionals	3.74	3.99
41.	Understanding liabilities	4.19	4.32
PROGRAM SERVICES			
	Remediation		
3.	Managing the VOED laboratory	3.82	4.13
9.	Selecting VOED materials	4.02	4.24
	Tutoring		
5.	Managing related class	3.80	4.10
8.	Using appropriate instruction	4.07	4.27
12.	Relating math and science	4.06	4.12
15.	Insuring appropriate safety	4.34	4.44
17.	Developing youth organizations	3.58	3.66
22.	Maintaining high standards	4.28	4.22
	Specialized Service		
2.	Adjusting VOED curriculum	3.58	4.10
4.	Evaluating VOED laboratory	3.90	4.15
6.	Evaluating related classes	3.77	4.03
10.	Modifying VOED instruction	3.57	4.15
14.	Motivating students	4.45	4.48
16.	Grading student work	3.97	4.17
18.	Developing communication skills	4.24	4.39
19.	Controlling student behavior	4.15	4.24
20.	Managing student behavior	4.12	4.21
24.	Developing goals and objectives	3.93	4.14
25.	Adjusting to learning styles	4.08	4.39
26.	Guiding tutorial services	3.44	3.92
42.	Managing the IEP	3.44	4.11
43.	Applying variety to techniques	4.29	4.42
44.	Developing behaviorial objectives	3.89	4.10
45.	Instructing to individual differences	3.95	4.22

Table 24. Cont'd--

POST-PROGRAM SERVICES

	Job Placement		
21.	Enhancing community involvement	3.92	4.01
27.	Obtaining community serivces	3.64	3.90
46.	Facilitating cooperative relationships	3.99	4.17
	Follow-Up		
11.	Placing students in community jobs	4.11	4.22
13.	Follow-up of graduates	3.66	3.75
31.	Visiting with families	3.75	3.93
36.	Helping families with goals	3.79	3.97
40.	Communicating with families	3.99	4.15

Mean Scale: 1-No importance
2-Little importance
3-Some importance
4-Considerable importance
5-Great importance

N=331

Table 25.
CATEGORICAL LIST OF NEED-FOR-TRAINING MEAN SCORES BY THREE MAJOR PROGRAM AREAS AND EIGHT FACTORS

Number	Definition	Need-For-Training VOED MEAN	SPED MEAN
PRE-PROGRAM SERVICES			
	Assessment and Evaluation		
7.	Interpreting test data	3.12	3.51
30.	Obtaining school related support	3.14	4.43
32.	Testing performance	3.15	3.49
33.	Evaluating achievement records	3.01	3.19
38.	Interpreting student records	2.99	3.25
	Counseling and Referral		
23.	Processing appropriate records	2.77	3.04
28.	Offering advice	3.22	3.39
37.	Recruiting through assessment	3.27	3.44
	Program Placement		
1.	Defining VOED curriculum	2.92	3.41
29.	Providing learning environment	3.28	3.51
34.	Developing vocational goals	3.17	3.45
35.	Identifying school personnel	2.99	3.26
39.	Conferring with professionals	3.10	3.35
41.	Understanding liabilities	3.74	3.89
PROGRAM SERVICES			
	Remediation		
3.	Managing the VOED laboratory	3.05	3.60
9.	Selecting VOED materials	3.24	3.71
	Tutoring		
5.	Managing related class	2.97	3.52
8.	Using appropriate instruction	3.27	3.76
12.	Relating math and science	3.48	3.68
15.	Insuring appropriate safety	3.34	3.55
17.	Developing youth organizations	2.90	3.08
22.	Maintaining high standards	3.37	3.50
	Specialized Service		
2.	Adjusting VOED curriculum	2.91	3.66
4.	Evaluating VOED laboratory	3.06	3.60
6.	Evaluating related classes	2.96	3.56
10.	Modifying VOED instruction	3.09	3.78
14.	Motivating students	3.89	3.99
16.	Grading student work	3.00	3.46
18.	Developing communication skills	3.50	3.80
19.	Controlling student behavior	3.38	3.58
20.	Managing student behavior	3.38	3.57
24.	Developing goals and objectives	3.10	3.45
25.	Adjusting to learning styles	3.45	3.89
26.	Guiding tutorial services	3.00	3.41
42.	Managing the IEP	3.02	3.63
43.	Applying variety to techniques	3.55	3.83
44.	Developing behaviorial objectives	3.24	3.56
45.	Instructing to individual differences	3.44	3.77

Table 25. Cont'd--

POST-PROGRAM SERVICES

	Job Placement		
21.	Enhancing community involvement	3.33	3.47
27.	Obtaining community serivces	3.20	3.49
46.	Facilitating cooperative relationships	3.27	3.46
	Follow-Up		
11.	Placing students in community jobs	3.29	3.69
13.	Follow-up of graduates	2.86	3.03
31.	Visiting with families	2.92	3.11
36.	Helping families with goals	3.08	3.33
40.	Communicating with families	3.10	3.27

Mean Scale: 1-No importance
2-Little importance
3-Some importance
4-Considerable importance
5-Great importance

N=331

APPENDIX C

DEFINITION OF TERMS

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Many terms used in this study deal specifically with the educational programs of special needs students who are enrolled in vocational education. These terms may not be common knowledge across all areas of education; therefore, for the specific purposes of this study, uniformity will be provided to the research by the definitions of the terms common to vocational education mainstreaming. These include the following:

Curriculum Modification - the tailoring of the experiences and activities encountered in pursuit of occupational preparation under the direction of a school to meet the unique needs of the individual student.

Disadvantaged - individuals (other than handicapped individuals) who have economic or academic disadvantages and who require special services and assistance in order to enable them to succeed in vocational education programs. The term includes individuals who are members of economically disadvantaged families, migrants, incarcerated, individuals who have limited English proficiency and individuals who are dropouts from, or who are identified as potential dropouts from, secondary school. (P.L. 98-524)

Handicapped - individuals who are mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech- or language-impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, orthopedically impaired, or other health-impaired persons, or persons with specific learning disabilities, who by reason thereof require special education and related services, and who, because of their handicapping condition, cannot succeed in the regular vocational education program without special education assistance. (P.L. 98-524)

Individualized Education Program (IEP) - program for handicapped learners, mandated by P.L. 94-142, planned cooperatively with support personnel. The IEP must have the present level of educational performance, annual goals and short-term objectives, amount of time spent in regular educational programs, necessary support services, and an annual review date.

Individualized Prescribed Program (IPP) - program for disadvantaged

students planned cooperatively with support personnel.

Mainstreaming - the inclusion of special needs learners in regular education classes with as much extra support from professional specialists as each learner requires.

Modification - the act of altering or changing some process or object to make it more functional. It could be a change in facility, equipment, furniture, or tool use in an instructional program in order to eliminate a barrier for a handicapped person.

Regular Vocational Education Program - the full-time participation in a regular vocational education program with slight modifications and/or resources.

Related Services - transportation and such developmental, corrective, and other supportive services as are required to assist a handicapped child to benefit from special education; and includes speech pathology and audiology, psychological services, physical and occupational therapy, recreation, early identification and assessment of disabilities in children, counseling services, and medical services for diagnostic or evaluation purposes. The term also includes school health services, social work services in schools, and parents counseling and training.

Special Education - a broad term covering programs and services for learners who require unique learning experiences, techniques, and materials in order to be maintained in the regular program or in specialized classes when necessary.

Special Education Teacher - special teacher who is employed by the school system to provide instruction and services for handicapped learners.

Special Needs Learner - individual who encounters or is likely to encounter difficulty in educational or employment settings because of a disability, economic or academic disadvantage, who has different linguistic or cultural background, or outdated job skills, and who requires individually prescribed and unique teaching strategies; supportive services that vary in type and extent depending on the individual need; and additional resources from society for his or her acceptance.

Special Vocational Education Program - participation in a self-contained special vocational program classroom.

Vocational Education - organized educational programs which are directly related to the preparation of individuals for paid or unpaid employment in such fields as agriculture, business occupations, marketing and distributive occupations technical

and emerging occupations, modern industrial and agricultural arts, and trade and industrial occupations, or for additional preparation for a career in such fields, and in other occupations requiring other than a baccalaureate or advanced degree and vocational student organization activities as an integral part of the program. (P.L. 98-524)

END

U.S. Dept. of Education

Office of Education
Research and
Improvement (OERI)

ERIC

Date Filmed

March 29, 1991